

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXX, 3.

WHOLE NO. 119.

I.—LATER ECHOES OF THE GREEK BUCOLIC POETS.

The influence of Theocritus upon the later classical poets is well set forth in Fritzsche's Latin commentary, Leipsic, 1870. The same great commentary cites also a number of parallels from modern literature, but these have been less carefully collected and much has been left for the gleaners. As for the influence of Bion and Moschus upon modern poetry, the field seems hardly to have been reaped at all.

THEOCRITUS.

Idyl I. The first Idyl is imitated in the first of Luigi Alamanni's Italian Eclogues,¹ a lament for Cosmo Rucellai who died in 1514. Alamanni follows his Greek model very closely, though he makes one or two changes. His "wooden bowl" is carved with a different set of scenes, and Fortuna takes the place of Cypris in her visit to the dying hero. His method may be illustrated by his treatment of lines 25-63:

Et io in cambio di cio t'assegnio in dono
Vna candida capra che due figli
Simiglianti nutrice, e ciascun giorno

¹Opere toscane di Luigi Alamanni, Lyons, 1532, p. 108. Alamanni's Eclogues are not mentioned in Cipollini's bibliography of Theocritus, Milan, 1887. This one is earlier, and perhaps better, than the other Italian imitations of Idyl I which he cites from Trissino, Benedetto Varchi and Annibal Caro (pp. 31-40). Varchi's note on his own 'imitation of the Thyrsis' indicates that the adaptation of this Greek dirge had already become a regular literary fashion: "Secondo il costume moderno, è introdotto sotto il nome di Menalca l'amico Luca Martini a piangere sotto quello di Dafni l'acerba et immatura morte dell' amico Filippo Martini", etc.

Di latte quasi due uasetti colma.
 Seruoti appresso un ricco uaso ornato
 D'odorato ginepro; il qual di fuore
 Hedera intorno cinge e'l verde achantho,
 Dentro¹ per dotta man con arte sculte
 Son primavera, estate, autunno, e verno . . .
 Questo adunque sia tuo s'hor ne concedi
 Quel soaue cantar, del quale auaro
 Esser non si deuria, percio ch'n breue
 Vien poscia morte e noi fa muti e sordi.

The first eleven lines are imitated in the first twenty-four lines of Clément Marot's 'Complainte de Madame Loyse de Savoye' (1531). Thus one singer is called a match for Pan, the other for the Muses:

S'il gaigne en prix un beau fourmage tendre,
 Tu gaigneras un pot de laict caillé;
 Ou si le laict il ayme plus cher prendre,
 A toy sera le fourmage baillé, etc.

With lines 12-14, τὰς δ' αἰγὰς ἐγὼν ἐν τῷδε νομεισῶ, compare Marot,

Or je te pry, tandis que mon mastin
 Fera bon guet, et que je feray paistre
 Noz deux troupeaux, chante un peu, etc.

With lines 23-25, αἱ δὲ κ' αἰέσσης, and 57-61, τῷ μὲν ἐγὼ πορθμῆ, compare

Et si tes vers sont d'aussi bonne mise
 Que les derniers que tu feis d'Ysabeau,
 Tu n'auras pas la chose qu'ay promise,
 Ains beaucoup plus, et meilleur et plus beau, etc.

And, through Marot, this passage is echoed again in the November eclogue of Spenser's 'Shepheards Calender', 43-46:

And, if thy rymes as rownde and ruffall bene
 As those that did thy Rosalind complayne,
 Much greater gyfts for guerdon thou shalt gayne
 Then Kidde or Cosset, which I thee bynempt.

¹ Compare Spenser, 'Shepheards Calender', viii. 26, "A mazer ywrought of the Maple warre, | *Wherein* is enchased many a fair sight", etc. Sannazaro's imitation of Theocritus, 'Arcadia', Prosa iv, has "tiene nel suo mezzo dipento"—compare Virgil's "in medio", Ecl. iii. 40—and Ronsard's paraphrase of Sannazaro (Ecl. i.) has "Presque tout au milieu du gobelet est peint", etc.

Lines 1-11 are imitated also in the first eclogue of J. C. Scaliger's 'Nymphae Indigenae':¹

Semicaper tenerum si ludit arundine carmen,
Obiectu nemorum lento secretus ab aestu,
Cur tacitae sedeant Musae vocalibus antris?
Ille caprum tantae capiet si praemia laudis,
Ipsae agnum accipient. Illi si cesserit agnus,
His caper ad sacras haerebit cornibus aras, etc.

And the same passage, ἄδιον, ὦ ποιμήν, κ. τ. λ., may have influenced Tennyson's "small sweet Idyl", at the close of 'The Princess':

and sweet is every sound,
Sweeter thy voice, but every sound is sweet; etc.

Lines 16-18. For Pan's noonday rest, and the wrath on his nostrils, *χολὰ ποτὶ ῥινὶ κάθηται*, compare Sannazaro's 'Arcadia', Egl. ix. 146-7,

Che torna all' ombra pien d'orgoglio et d'ira
Col naso aduncho afflando amaro toscò;

Baïf, Ecl. xix,²

reuenant de la chasse
Dessus le chaud du jour (lors que tout il menasse
De courroux, qui le fait renifler des naseaux);

Milton, 'Epitaphium Damonis', 51-2,

Aut aestate, dies medio dum vertitur axe,
Cum Pan aesculea somnum capit abditus umbra;

Leconte de Lisle, 'Pan',

Le Dieu fuit de midi les ardeurs radieuses;
Il s'endort; etc.

Lines 27-60. The wooden cup, *ἔτι γλυφάνοιο ποτόσδον*, is borrowed in Ronsard, Ecl. v, "encores elle sent La cire et le burin". The pictures of the coquettish maiden and the old fisherman are imitated in detail. The picture (49-54) of the boy plaiting a locust-cage while a fox³ steals his dinner is repeated on Guisin's crook, Ronsard, Ecl. i. So on Sannazaro's cup, 'Arcadia',

¹ Iulii Caesaris Scaligeri viri clarissimi Poemata. Anno 1574, p. 273.

² Euvres en Rime de Ian Antoine de Baïf, edited by Ch. Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1886, vol. iii, p. 106.

³ Tennyson's phrase "foxlike in the vine", toward the close of 'The Princess', is probably due to a memory of Theocritus, rather than to any observation of English vineyards.

Prosa iv (p. 65, Scherillo), there is a boy "intento ad fare una sua picciola gabia di paglia et di giunchi, forse per rinchiudervi y cantanti grilli". With lines 57-60 compare Sannazaro (p. 66), "Et giuroti per le deytà de' sacri fonti che giamai le mie labra nol toccharono, ma sempre lo ho guardato nectissimo ne la mia tasca da l'hora che una capra et due grandi fiscelle di premuto lacte il comparay da uno navigante, che nei nostri boschy venne da lontani paesi". Compare also Antonio Ferreira's new bowl of ivy-wood, Egl. vii, "hũ tarro d'Hera . . . trazido D'estranhas terras". Lines 27 ff. are translated by Leconte de Lisle, 'Le Vase'.¹

Lines 66-9, $\pi\eta\ \pi\alpha\kappa'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho'\ \eta\sigma\theta'$, are imitated by Luigi Alamanni, Egl. i,²

Oue uoi Muse allhor che la chiara alma
Del diuin Cosmo al sommo ciel salio?
Non gia non gia lungo le fresche riue
Del suo chiaro Arno, etc.;

and by Antonio Ferreira, Egl. vii,

Versos a Daphnis, doces versos demos.
Voz de Licidas he, que Marilia ama.
Que fontes, ou que bosques lá forçadas
Vos tinham, de Apollo irmãs fermosas,
Quando a Daphnis as cores demudadas
Vos não tornavam delle piadosas? . . .
Tinha-vos por ventura o vosso monte?
O as alturas lá do fresco Pindo?
Porque eu não creio que em sua branda fonte
Vos estivesse o Mondego encobrindo. . .
Daphnis choráram na montanha as féras.
Choráram os Lobos, os Lioões choráram.

With line 71, $\tau\eta\gamma\omicron\nu\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \theta\omega\epsilon\varsigma,\ \tau\eta\gamma\omicron\nu\ \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omicron\iota\ \acute{\omega}\rho\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\alpha\gamma\tau\omicron$, compare the second Eclogue of Pietro Angelio Bargeo, "et Lycidam flebunt thoësque lupique."³

¹ It is not the purpose of this paper to record actual translations of Theocritus, though noteworthy versions of single Idyls are sometimes mentioned. Lists of translations are given in Fritzsche's commentary, Leipsic, 1870, and in the 'Studio critico-bibliografico' prefixed to Cipollini's translation, Milan, 1887.

² Milton's 'Lycidas', 50-55, "Where were ye, Nymphs", etc., has been claimed for Virgil, Ecl. x. 9-12. And either Theocritus or Virgil might account for Shelley's 'Adonais', 10, "Where wert thou, mighty Mother, when he lay", etc.

³ Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italorum, Florence, 1719, vol. i, p. 206.

With lines 77-78, ἦνθ' Ἐρμῆς πρῶτιστος, compare Baif, Ecl. ii (p. 12): "Mercure point ne tarde, Mais tout premier y volle, . . . Doù te vient ce meschef? (Dit-il)", etc. And the same passage is imitated in Milton's 'Epitaphium Damonis', 75 ff., in the coming of Mopsus and the Nymphs.¹

Lines 95-101 are imitated by Antonio Ferreira, Egl. xi,

Veo Venus, sorrindo-se comsigo,
O riso he falso, esconde a dor no peito.
Androgeo, diz, consola-te comigo.

With lines 115-121 compare Sannazaro, 'Arcadia', Prosa viii (p. 150 Sch.): "O lupi, o orsi et qualunche animali per le orrende spelunche vi nascondete, rimanetevi, addio; eccho che più non viderete quel vostro bifolcho che per li monti et per li boschi solea cantare. Addio, rive; addio, piaggie verdissime et fiumi: vivete senza me lungo tempo; et mentre murmurando per le petrose valle currerete nel' alto mare, abbiate sempre nela memoria il vostro Charino. Il quale cqui le sue vacche pasceva, il quale cqui y suo tori coronava, il quale qui con la sampognia gli armenti, mentre beveano, solea dilectare".² And all this, and much more, is translated from Sannazaro in Garcilaso de la Vega, Egl. ii,

O lobos, o osos, que por los rincones
De estas fieras cavernas escondidos
Estais oyendo agora mis razones,
Quedaos á Dios, etc.

¹ Milton's invocation of the "Himerides Nymphae" indicates that he has Theocritus in mind, not Virgil.

² Professor Mahaffy thinks that the 'Arcadia' cannot contain many direct imitations of Theocritus, "for that poet was not adequately printed till 1495, which must have been very near the date of the actual composition of the Arcadia" ('Rambles in Greece', chap. xii). But the imitation here is direct enough, and so are the cases which I have quoted on Id. i. 16-18, 49-60; v. 61-65, 72-75, 84-85, 106; vii. 132-146; viii. 18-19; xviii. 48. And Sannazaro knew Theocritus at first-hand (Scherillo, Introd., pp. 79-80). Moreover, the 'Arcadia' in its original form (comprising the first ten 'Prose' and 'Egloghe') was written earlier than 1495. Summonte, the editor of the edition of 1504, says that it was composed "nela prima adolescentia del poeta"—and Sannazaro was born in 1458. It is found in a Naples MS of the year 1489. And it even seems to have been imitated before 1486, by Pietro Jacobo Gianuario (E. Percopo, La prima imitazione dell' 'Arcadia', Naples, 1894). It is perhaps worth observing that all the Theocritus which I have found in the 'Arcadia' comes from the first eighteen Idyls, the eighteen Idyls which were printed in the 'editio princeps' (Milan, c. 1481).

Lines 139-141 are imitated in Francesco Berni's eclogue 'Amyntas',

Olli tergeminae nerant iam stamina Parcae,
Iam medium Stygiis Proserpina merserat undis
Dilectum Musis caput et pastoribus aequae.¹

With lines 146-9, *πλήρης τοι μέλιτος*, compare Ronsard, Ecl. iii (Michau's verdict),

De manne à tout jamais vos deux bouches soient pleines,
and Ecl. v (Lansac's verdict),

Vos bouches à jamais se remplissent de miel . . .
Puis que vos deux chansons surmontent les cigales.

Compare also Tenot's words in Baïf, Ecl. iii,

Tousiours pleine de miel,
Pleine ta bouche soit, puis que d'un si doux son
Tu sçais, mon cher Toinet, attremper ta chanson
. Et vraiment ie te donne
Vn beau Rebec que i'ay, etc.

With lines 148-9 compare Leconte de Lisle, *Hélène*, i,

Vieillard, ta voix est douce; aucun son ne l'égale.
Telle chante au soleil la divine cigale;
Prends cette coupe d'or par Hèphaistos forgée.

The last two lines of this Idyl are used to point a curious moral by Pierre de Lancre: "Je diray donc volontiers et sur tout aux ieunes fillettes qui se laissent debaucher et en sorceler à ce vieux Bouc de Satan, ce que tres à propos souloit dire Theocrite en quelque part:

Vos vero capellae, nolite saltare,
Ne forte in vos hircus incurrat—

Ne sautez point, ieunes fillettes, et ne vous agitez, affin que ce malheureux Bouc ne coure après vous. Le Diable qui se representé en bouc au sabbat, faict tous exercices soubz la figure et forme de cet animal", etc.²

Idyl II. The second Idyl is closely imitated in Luigi Alamanni's seventh Eclogue, with one passage added from Virgil (Ecl. viii. 74-79). Alamanni's whole poem might be called a

¹ *Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italorum*, Florence, 1719, vol. ii. p. 150.

² *Tableau de l'Inconstance des mauvais anges et demons*, Paris, 1612, p. 205. The same author (p. 50) translates the *πομπὴν* of Idyl ii. 72 by "magicam pompam", and naively adds, "qui est le Sabbat."

translation of Theocritus, were it not that the love-story of Simaetha (63-166) is adapted—much as it is in the second part of Baïf's Eclogue xvi. Compare, for instance, lines 38-41, *ἤνιδε σιγῇ μὲν πόρτος*, with

Hor l'aria tace e'l uento, hor tace il mare,
Ma non gia tace amor dentro al mio petto;
Che quel chiamo ad ognihor che gia di Donna
M'ha fatta (lassa) una notturna fera.

The first part of this Idyl is paraphrased by Baïf, Ecl. v, 'Les Sorcieres' (with some details added from Virgil, Ecl. viii).¹ With lines 12-13, *τῇ χθονίᾳ θ' Ἐκάτῃ*, compare

Mesmes les chiens te craignent et redoutent
Quand des enfers sus la terre tu sors
Te pourmenant par les tumbes des mors—

also Ben Jonson's 'Sad Shepherd', ii. 1,

when our Dame Hecate
Made it her gaing-night over the kirkyard,
With all the barkand parish tikes set at her.

With lines 38-40, *ἤνιδε σιγῇ μὲν πόρτος*, compare Baïf,

Tout se taist ore, ores les eaux se taisent,
Le bois se taist, les Zefires s'apaisent,
Tout s'assoupit sous la muette nuit:
Mais mon ennuy qui sans repos me suit,
Ne se taist pas au dedans de mon ame, etc.

With line 58, *κακὸν ποτὸν αὔριον οἶσῶ*, compare Sannazaro's fifth Latin Eclogue, 'Herpylis Pharmaceutria',

Tunde iecur, spumamque simul torpedinis atrae.
Haec ego cras illi lethalia pocula mittam;

and Gay's 'Shepherd's Week', v (Thursday),

These golden flies into his mug I'll throw.

With lines 103-9, *ἐγὼ δὲ νῦν ὡς ἐνόησα*, compare Racine, Phèdre, i. 3,

Je le vis, je rougis, je pâlis à sa vue;
Un trouble s'éleva dans mon âme éperdue;
Mes yeux ne voyaient plus, je ne pouvais parler,
Je sentis tout mon corps et transir et brûler.

¹ Baïf's poem begins, "Suyuans, Du Faur, d'une gentile audace Des vieux Gregeois la mieux eslite trace, Et des Romains, maugré les ignorans, De vers hardis nos Muses honorans": etc.

Lines 82-90 and 133-4 are quoted in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, among the Symptoms of Love.¹

Idyl III, *Κωμάσδω ποτὶ τὰν Ἀμαρυλλίδα*. The first seventeen lines are paraphrased in Luigi Alamanni's ninth Eclogue, with a passage added from Virgil (Ecl. ii. 8-13):

Io uo ratto à trouar la bella Phylli,
Et senza il Tyrsi suo le mie caprette
Stien con Tytiro, qui d'intorno al monte, etc.

The whole Idyl is paraphrased in Benedetto Varchi's 'Amarilli',²

Io vo cantando a trovare Amarilli, etc.

It is imitated in Ronsard's 'Voyage de Tours', where lines 12-33 are borrowed in Thoinet's song. Compare, for example, lines 20-23 with

Souvent un vain baiser quelque plaisir apporte.
Je meurs! tu me feras despecer ce bouquet,
Que j'ay cueilly pour toi, de thym et de muguet,
Et de la rouge fleur qu'on nomme cassandrette, etc.

It is translated, line for line, by Hugo Grotius, *Farraginis lib. i*, 'Comastes, ex Theocrito', and imitated in Grotius' 'Myrtilus, sive Idyllium Nauticum, ad Danielelem Heinsium'. Compare, for example, lines 6-7 with

Cochli, quid expectas? quin, ut prius ipsa solebas,
Prospicis intonsi specula de montis in undas,
Meque procul reducem longo clamore salutas?

Other passages imitated in 'Myrtilus' are lines 21-23, 25-27, 37-39. And Grotius' 'Myrtilus' is itself paraphrased in Sarasin's eclogue 'Myrtil, ou le Nautonnier'.³ Fritzsche quotes an amusing imitation by Fr. Dörr (1858):

Zu Amaryllis will ich nun mit meiner Flöte eilen,
Derweil die lieben Ziegen ruhn und an den Bergen weilen.
Ach, Tityrus, indess ich fern, hat meine Herde keinen Herrn:
Sei du so gut und hüte.

¹ Burton quotes a dozen other passages from Theocritus: Id. xv. 77, iv. 41-2, ix. 31, xviii. 35, viii. 82-3, xxvii. 59, vi. 17, x. 40, xiii. 70-1, i. 151-2, xii. 15-6, xviii. 49-56.

² *Poesie Pastorali e Rusticali*, ed. G. Ferrario, Milan, 1808, p. 250. Cipollini failed to notice Varchi's poem in this volume, and cites it, as still unprinted, from a Florence MS of the year 1539.

³ *Poésies de François Sarasin*, publ. Octave Uzanne, Paris, 1877, pp. 193-201.

Line 20 (repeated in Id. xxvii. 4),

ἔστι καὶ ἐν κενεοῖσι φίλημασιν ἀδέα τέρψις,

is translated among Poliziano's Latin epigrams,¹

Et vanis in basiolis iucunda voluptas,

and in M. Antonio Renieri's 'Egloga Phillide'² (written before 1539),

Ché ne li vani baci piacer non lieve si gusta.

Line 34, *διδυματόκον αἶγα φυλάσσω* is echoed in the same poem of Renieri,

*Né la colomba solo, ma quella mia capra darotti
Che li due figli nutre, etc.*

Idyl IV. The names Battus and Corydon are borrowed for the two herdsmen in Luigi Alamanni's fifth Eclogue.

On lines 41-43 Fritzsche quotes Io. Stigelius, 'Phryxus et Menalcas' (1553),

*Est quoque, Phryxe, decus dubiis confidere rebus.
Crastina forte dies meliore fulserit aura . . .
Nonne vides coelum vultu nunc ire sereno,
Quod prius obductis condebant nubila nimbis?*

And the same passage is echoed in Baïf, Ecl. xiii,

*Espere : L'espoir est des viuans le confort :
On ne peut esperer depuis que l'on est mort.*

It is imitated also in Marcantonio Flaminio's eclogue 'Thyrsis' (printed in 1515),

*Non semper gelidis effundit nubibus imbres
Iuppiter, aut vasti feriunt cava littora fluctus
Semper, et iratis strident Aquilonibus auræ.
Tu quoque vesano finem sperare dolori
Aude, hospes. Forsan miserum meliora sequentur.*

Line 42, *ἐλπίδες ἐν ζωοῖσιν*, is quoted in the 'Lamentationes Obscurorum Virorum', vii: "quum vel Theocrito teste vivis duntaxat sperandum sit."

¹ Aldine ed., Venice, 1498, fol. hh, iii.

² Carducci, *La Poesia Barbarica nei Secoli xv e xvi*, Bologna, 1881, p. 82.

³ Quoted in Volpi's edition of the *Opere Volgari e Latine del Conte Baldessar Castiglione*, Padua, 1733, pp. 368-69.

Idyl V. The fifth Idyl is imitated in Sannazaro's 'Arcadia', Egl. ix. Compare lines 61-65 with Sann. 29-33, where one herdsman rejects the umpire proposed by the other, and suggests a second. With lines 72-75, *ἄδε τοι ἁ ποιμένα*, compare Sann. 43-48,

Montan, costui che meco ad cantar provasi
Guarda le capre d'un pastor erratico, etc.;

and with lines 84-85 compare Sann. 61-63,

Quando talhora alla stagion novella
Mugno le capre mie, mi scherne et ride
La mia suave et dolce pastorella.

The first eighty-four lines are closely imitated by Luigi Alamanni, Egl. v. Compare, for instance, lines 45-49, *οὐχ ἐρψῶ τηραί*, with

Qui m'intend' io restar ch'ho d'ogni parte
Herbe odorate, onde sen uanno à schiera
L'api di fior in fior sonando intorno.
Qui son due riui, e ne i frondosi rami
Dolce i dipinti augei cantan d'amore,
Qui l'ombra è fresca; oue superbo il pino
Fia sibilando de miei uersi aita.

With lines 55-58, *αἱ δέ κε καὶ τὸ μῶλῃς*, compare M. Antonio Renieri, 'Egloga Phillide',

Vien, ché la terra sia con molte mie pelli caprine,
Che più molli sono del molle agnello, coperta;
E tu su quelle (che non t'offenda l'odore)
Sette di latte puro vasi colmi sparsi vedrai.

With line 106, *κύων φιλοποιμνιος, ὃς λύκος ἄγχει*, compare Sannazaro, 'Arcadia', Prosa ii (p. 22 Sch.), "un cane animoso, strangulatore de lupi."

With lines 132-3, *οὐκ ἔραμ' Ἀλκίπας*, compare Ronsard, Ecl. iv,

Je portay l'autre jour deux tourtres à Cassandre,
Et mon present et moy beaucoup elle pris :
De sa blanchette main l'aureille me vint prendre,
Et plus de mille fois doucement me baisa,

and Baif, Ecl., xiii,

O là combien de fois me prenant par l'oreille
Elle m'a rebaisé de sa bouche vermeille !

Idyl VI. The two songs of Daphnis and Damoetas are paraphrased at the close of Baif's Eclogue xix. With the first compare the song of Pineau,

Polypheme Berger, Galatee la belle
Iettant à ton bestail force pommes, t'appelle
Bel amoureux transi: etc.;

with the other, the song of Robin,

Ie l'ay fort bien ouye: ainsi comme elle ruë
Des pomes à mon chien, de cet oeil ie l'ay vuë,
Cet oeil qui m'est tant cher: etc.

The whole Idyl is freely imitated in an Idilio of Villegas,¹

Viniéronse á juntar Dafne y Dametas, etc.

Compare, for example, line 6, Βάλλει τοι, Πολύφαιε, with

¿ No ves, o Polifemo, como tira
La blanca Galatea á tu ganado?

Lines 44-45 are imitated in Daniel Heinsius' 'Ecloga Bucolica Nordowicum',

Sic pueri cecinere: leues in fronde capellae
Cumque suis blandae salierunt matribus agnae.

Idyl VII. The opening lines are imitated at the beginning of Tennyson's 'Gardener's Daughter',

This morning is the morning of the day,
When I and Eustace from the city went
To see the Gardener's Daughter.

Then, just as in the Greek poem, we have an account of two of the speaker's friends.

The name Phrasidamus, line 3, is borrowed in Sannazaro's fourth Latin Eclogue, line 24.

With line 22,

ἀνίκα δὲ καὶ σαῦρος ἐν αἵμασιαιῖσι καθεύδει,

compare Tennyson's 'Oenone', 26-27,

The lizard, with his shadow on the stone,
Rests like a shadow.

¹ Tesoro del Parnaso español, ed. M. J. Quintana, Paris, 1838, pp. 164-166.

The song of Lycidas, lines 52 ff., is imitated in Ronsard's 'Voyage de Tours' (Perrot's song). Compare, especially, lines 63-73 with

Je veux jusques au coude avoir l'herbe, et si veux
De roses et de lys couronner mes cheveux ;
Je veux qu'on me défonce une pippe angevine
Et en me souvenant de ma toute divine,
De toy, mon doux soucy, espuser jusqu' au fond
Mille fois ce jourd'huy mon gobelet profond . . .
Melchior Champenois et Guillaume Manceau, etc.

And the beginning of Lycidas' song, *Ἔσsetai Ἀγέανακτι καλὸς πλόος*, is imitated in the first eclogue of J. C. Scaliger's 'Nymphae Indigenae',

Ad veteres Bandellus auos patriosque Penates
Traicit, insani veritus nihil aequora ponti . . .
Ille vel infestis caelum cum soluitur hoedis,
Vel cum deuexo surgit Notus aethere, vel cum
Vdae praecipiti superant Atlantides imbri,
Vtetur placidi genio maris
Mollia pacato spirabunt flamina plausu, etc.

With lines 109-113, compare Ronsard, Ecl. iv,

puissent-ils arriver
Avecque leurs troupeaux, quand les fleurs renouvellent,
Au Printemps en Afrique, en la Thrace l'Hyver . . .
Puissest-elles dormir au milieu des orties,
Après avoir gratté leurs corps jusques au sang.

Lines 132-146 are paraphrased in Sannazaro's 'Arcadia', Prosa x: "ne pusimo insieme con Ergasto in lecti di alti lentischi distesi ad iacere. Ove molti olmi, molte quercie et molti allori sibillando con le tremule frondi, ne si moveano per sopra al capo; ay quali agiongendosi anchora il murmurare dele roche onde (le quale, fugendo velocissime per le verde herbe, andavano ad cercare il piano) rendevano insieme piacivolissimo suono ad udire. Et per li ombrosi rami le argute cicale cantando se affatigavano sotto al gran caldo; la mesta Philomena da lungi tra folti spineti ululava; cantavano le merle, le upope et le calandre; piangeva la solitaria turtora per le alte ripe; le sollicite ape con suave susurro volavano intorno ay fonti. Ognie cosa redoliva di la fertile estate: redolivano y pomi per terra sparsi, de' quali tucto il suolo dinanci ay piedi et per ognie lato ne vedevamo in abondanza coverto, sopra ay quali y bassi alberi con li gravosi rami stavano sì inchinati, che, quasi vinti dal

mature peso, parecia che spezzare si volesseno".¹ And, through Sannazaro, the passage is repeated in Valbuena, 'Siglo de Oro', Prosa x: "Aquí el ronco faisán sonaba, allí las suaves calandrias se oían, acullá cantaban los zorzales, las miras y las abubillas, y hasta las industriosas abejas á nuestras espaldas con blando susurrar de una florecilla en otra iban saltando: todo olía á verano, todo prometía un año fértil y abundoso", etc.

Line 35, *ἔνθα γὰρ ὁδοί, ἔνθα δὲ καὶ δῶς*, seems to be reflected in Milton's 'Lycidas', 25-27 (See A. J. P. XXI 235):

Together both, ere the high lawns appeared
Under the opening eyelids of the Morn,
We drove afield.

Lines 138-143 are imitated in Tennyson's 'Gardener's Daughter',

All the land in flowery squares,
Beneath a broad and equal-blowing wind,
Smelt of the coming summer
. . . . From the woods
Came voices of the well-contented doves.
The lark could scarce get out his notes for joy,
. . . . To left and right
The cuckoo told his name to all the hills;
The mellow ouzel fluted in the elm;
The redcap whistled; and the nightingale
Sang loud, as tho' he were the bird of day.

And the orchard feast of lines 144-147 seems to have suggested the orchard feast of Tennyson's 'Audley Court'—an 'English Idyl' which contains two "isometric" songs, to match the songs of Lycidas and Simichidas.

The whole of the seventh Idyl is translated by Leigh Hunt, in 'Foliage', London, 1818: 'The Rural Journey.'

Idyl VIII.² Paraphrased by Luigi Alamanni, Egl. viii, 'Daphni et Menalca', with the omission of lines 53-56 and 61-80. Com-

¹This passage has been rather unfortunately quoted as an example of Sannazaro's imitation of Virgil and Theocritus when he is "moins esclave de ses souvenirs": "Ce sont leurs paysages rapidement esquissés, avec quelque chose d'ailleurs qu'ils n'ont pas connu et qui demeure bien italien" (J. Marsan, 'La pastorale dramatique en France', Paris, 1905, p. 24).

²It may be noted that Professor Wilamowitz rejects this universal favorite as unworthy of Theocritus: "und wer das nicht empfindet, mit dem soll man nicht über Poesie reden", *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*, Berlin, 1906, p. 122.

pare, for example, lines 57-60, δένδρεσι μὲν χειμῶν φοβερὸν κακόν, with

Nuoce à gli arbori il uento, all'onde il luglio,
 À gli augelletti il uisco, à cerui il laccio,
 À giouinetti amor, deh Gioue e Phebo,
 Son' io solo ad amar, uoi pure amaste ?

The greater part of the Idyl (lines 25-80) is repeated in Ronsard's fifth Eclogue (ed. Blanchemain, vol. iv. pp. 96-103). Compare, for example, lines 63-70, φείδεν τᾶν ἐρίφων, φείδεν, λύκε, with

Loups, amis de ces bois, qui de jour et de nuit
 Aguettez le troupeau qui par l'herbe me suit,
 Pardonnez à mes boeufs, pardonnez à mes chèvres,
 Et à mes boucs cornus qui portent barbe aux lèvres.
 Et quoy, mon chien Harpaut, te faut il sommeiller,
 Estant près d'un enfant quand tu deusses veiller?
 Brebis, ne vous feignez de brouter cet herbage ;
 Tant plus il est brouté il revient d'avantage.
 Paissez-vous de bonne herbe et vous enfiez le pis, etc.

The eighth Idyl is imitated also in the third of Sannazaro's Latin Eclogues. Fritzsche compares line 33, ἄγρεα καὶ ποταμοί, θεῖον γένος, with Sann. iii. 46, "Nereides, pelagi sacrum genus"; and lines 52, ὁ Πρωτεύς φώκας καὶ θεὸς ὦν ἔνεμεν, and 59, ὦ πάτερ, ὦ Ζεῦ, with lines 62-65,

O Proteu, pastor liquidi maris, o pater, o rex . . .
 Dic Hyalae, falsum te pascere monstra per aequor ;

also lines 43-44, αἱ δ' ἂν ἀφίρπη | χῶ ποιμὴν ξηρὸς τηρόθι χαί βοράναι, with line 82, "Nulla mihi sine te virent' loca." It is imitated again by Leconte de Lisle, 'Les Bucoliastes'. Compare, for instance, lines 72-80, Κῆμ' ἐκ τῷ ἄνθρω, with

Souvent, au seuil de l'antré où la rouge verveine
 Croît auprès d'un lentisque et d'un vieil olivier,
 La fille au noir sourcil parut me convier.
 Par la rude Artémis ! son attente était vaine ;
 Car les boeufs sont la joie et l'honneur du bouvier.

With lines 18-19, σύγγ' ἂν ἐπόησα, compare Sannazaro, 'Arcadia', Prosa x, "una grande et bella sampogna . . . egualmente di sotto et di sopra congiunta con biancha cera". Compare, too, Ronsard, Ecl. iii,

En voulant l'attenuir le doigt je me coupé
 Avecque ma serpette ; encores de la playe
 Je me deuls, etc.

¹ Broukhusius' text of Sannazaro, Amsterdam, 1728, has *rident*.

With lines 33-41, ἀγρεα καὶ ποταμοί, compare Baïf, Ecl. xi,

Bel. O fleuves et pastis, si quelque chanson belle
Belin vous dit jamais, que vous ayez chérie,
Fournissez son troupeau de verdure nouvelle:
Pour Guillemot autant faites-en, je vous prie.

Guil. O fontaines, ô prez, si Guillemot surpasse,
A gringoter sa voix, le rossignol ramage,
Engraissez son bestail: et si Belin y passe,
Faites à son bestail tout le mesme auantage.

With lines 41-48, παντᾶ ἔαρ, παντᾶ δὲ νομοί, compare Luigi Alamanni, Elegie, i. 5,

Questa ouunque il bel pie leggiadro muoue
Empie di frondi e fior la terra intorno,
Che primauera è seco e uerno altroue.

With lines 53-56, μή μοι γὰρ Πέλοπος, compare Andrea Navagero's 'Iolas',¹

Non ego opes mihi, non cursu praevertere ventos
Optarim magis, aut pecoris quodcumque per orbem est,
Quam te, Amarylli, meis vinctam retinere lacertis
Et tecum has inter vitam deducere silvas,

and Baïf (who is following Navagero here), Ecl. vi,

Ie ne souhette paistre en vne large plaine
Mille troupeaux de boeufs et de bestes à laine:
Mais si je te tenoy, Francine, entre mes bras,
Pour tous les biens de Rois ie ne ferois vn pas.

And the same passage is translated in Carducci's 'Primavere Elleniche' (II. Dorica),

Oh di Pèlope re tenere il suolo
Oh non m'avvenga, o d'aurei talenti
Gran copia, e non de l'agil piede a volo
Vincere i venti!
Io vo' da questa rupe erma cantare,
Te fra le braccia avendo e via lontano
Calar vedendo l'agne bianche al mare
Siciliano.

Lines 57-60, δένδρεσι μὲν χειμὼν φοβερόν κακόν, (and Virgil, Ecl. iii. 80-81) are imitated by Ronsard, Ecl. ii,

L'orage est dangereux aux herbes et aux fleurs,
La froideur de l'automne aux raisins qui sont meurs,
Les vents aux bleds d'avril; mais l'absence amoureuse
A l'amant qui souspire est tousjours dangereuse;

¹ Andreae Naugerii opera omnia, Volpi ed., Padua, 1718, p. 205.

by Baïf, *Ecl.* vii,

Hé, les vignes en fleur craignent la gresle dure,
Les arbrisseaux feuillus de l'yuer la froidure,
Et la gueule des loups est la mort des moutons :
Mais le cruel amour est la mort des garçons ;

by Guarini, 'Pastor Fido', i. 5,

Come il gelo alle piante, ai fior l'arsura,
La grandine alle spiche, ai semi il verme,
Le reti ai cervi, ed agli augelli il visco ;
Così nemico all' uom fu sempre Amore ;

and by William Becan, *Idyllia Sacra*, vi,

CH. Accipiter nidis, stabulis lupus, improba vulpes
Corribus infesta est ; pueris amor atque puellis . . .
LY. Alitibus laquei, mendaces piscibus hami,
Retia caeca feris ; homini metuenda voluptas.¹

Lines 65-70 are imitated at the beginning of Navagero's
'Iolas':

Pascite, oves, teneras herbas per pabula laeta,
Pascite, nec plenis ignavae pascite campis :
Quantum vos tota minuetis luce, refectum
Fecundo tantum per noctem rore resurget.²
Hinc dulci distenta tumescent ubera lacte,
Sufficientque simul fisciellae et mollibus agnis.
Tu vero vigil, atque canum fortissime, Teucon,
Dum pascent illae late per prata, luporum
Incursus subitos saevasque avertit rapinas.
Interea hic ego muscoso prostratus in antro
Ipse meos solus mecum meditabor amores.

And, through Navagero, the passage is echoed again at the
beginning of Ronsard's second Eclogue :³

Paissez, douces brebis, paissez ceste herbe tendre,
Ne pardonnez aux fleurs : vous n'en sçauriez tant prendre
Par l'espace d'un jour qu'en peu d'heures la nuit
Humide de rosée autant en ait produit.
De là vous deviendrez plus grasses et plus belles,
L'abondance de lait enflera vos mammelles,

¹ Antwerp ed., 1667, p. 312.

² Compare Virgil, *Geor.* ii. 201-202,

Et quantum longis carpent armenta diebus,
Exigua tantum gelidus ros nocte reponet.

³ There is a direct imitation at the end of Ronsard's fifth Eclogue (quoted above, p. 258).

Et suffirez assez pour nourrir vos aigneaux
 Et pour faire en tout temps des fromages nouveaux.
 Et toy, mon chien Harpaut, seure et fidelle garde
 De mon troupeau camus, leve l'oeil et pren garde
 Que je ne sois pillé par les loups d'alentour,
 Ce-pendant qu'en ce bois je me plaindray d'Amour.¹

Compare also the opening lines of Baïf's sixth Eclogue :

Paissez douces brebis ces herbeux pasturages,
 Paissez et n'espargnez de ces chams les herbages :
 Autant que tout le jour d'icy vous leuerez,
 Le lendemain autant vous y retrouuerez,
 Qui reuiendra la nuit : vos pis en abondance
 S'empliront de doux lait : de lait à suffisance
 Pour charger les paniers de fourmages nouveaux,
 Et donner à teter à vos petits agneaux.
 Robin, en cependant qu'elles broutent l'herbette,
 Mon bergerot, tes yeux hors du troupeau ne jette.
 Mais garde le moy bien, . .
 Tandis me reposant dessous cette aubespine,
 Sur ce tertre bossu, de ma chere Francine
 Les amours à par moy seul ie recorderay, etc.

With line 72, *σύνοφρος κόρα*, compare Tennyson's phrase in 'Oenone', "the charm of married brows."

With lines 82-84, *ἀδύ τι τὸ στόμα τοι*, compare Baïf, Ecl. xix (the umpire's verdict),

Pineau, j'aimeroy mieux ouir tes chansonnettes
 Que de sucer du miel : Tu auras ces Musettes :
 Car elles sont à toy de bonne et juste gain ;

Baïf, Ecl. x,

Le sucre est doux, l'ouurage de l'abeille
 Est doux aussi : mais douce est à merveille
 Ta douce voix ;

Antonio Ferreira, Egloga vii, 'Daphnis',

Mel puro da tua doce boca mana,
 Meu Licidas, teus versos favos são ;

Gessner, Idylle vi, 'Lycas und Milon' (which is an imitation of Theocritus, viii), "Eure Lieder sind süß wie Honig"; and J. P. Hebel, 'Die Feldhüter',

'Friederli', seit der Heiner, 'gern issi Eyeren-Anke,
 Ziebele-Weihe so gern. Doch chönnti alles vergesse,
 hōri di lieblici Stimm und dini chünstlige Wise.'

¹ The whole of Ronsard's second Eclogue is a close imitation of Navagero's 'Iolas'. And the same thing may be said of Baïf's sixth.

With lines 88-89, οὕτως ἐπὶ μητέρα νεβρὸς ἀλοῖτο, compare Gessner, Idylle xvi, 'Menalkas und Aeschines', "und der junge Hirt hüpfte vor Freuden, wie ein junges Lamm hüpfst."

Idyl IX. Lines 7-21 and 31-35 are paraphrased by Ronsard, Ecl. ii (ed. Blanchemain, vol. iv. pp. 52-54),

Douce est du rossignol la rustique chanson, etc.

With lines 15-21 compare Baïf, Ecl. xi,

Bel. J'ay pour tout mon yuer chez moy force chauffage,
Et quoy qu'il face froid ie n'en ay non plus cure
Qu' vn édenté du pain, quand il a du potage.

Guil. J'ay vne belle caue, où tant que l'esté dure
Mon bestail ie retire : et, bien que tout se sente
Du chaud qui grille tout, rien du chaud ie n'endure.

With lines 31-32, τέττιξ μὲν τέττιγι φίλος, compare Tennyson, 'Princess', iii. 88,

'The crane', I said, 'may chatter of the crane,
The dove may murmur of the dove, but I
An eagle clang an eagle to the sphere'.

With lines 33-35, τόσσον ἐμὴν Μοῖσαι φίλαι, compare Ronsard, Ecl. i (p. 20),

Ny le printemps n'est point si plaisant aux fleurettes,
Ny la rosée aux prez, ny les blondes avettes
N'aiment tant à baiser les roses et le thin,
Que j'aime à celebrer les honneurs de Catin.

With lines 34-35, οὕτε μελίσσαις ἄνθεα, compare Gessner, Idylle xi (Daphnis und Chloe), "ich liebe dich, mehr als die Bienen die Blüten". Compare also the first of Nicholas Grimoald's 'Songes',

What sweet releef the showers to thirstie plants we see :
What dere delite, the blooms to beez : my trueloue is to mee,

a passage which seems to come from Navagero's 'Iolas',

Dulce apibus flores, rivi sitientibus herbis,
Gramen ovi, caprae cytisus, Amaryllis Iolae.

Idyl X. Paraphrased by Baïf, Ecl. xiv, 'Les Moissonneurs de Theocrite'.

With line 15, ὁ Πολυβότα (and Id. xv. 1, ἔνδοι Πραξινοά), compare Sannazaro's second Latin Eclogue, line 18,

At non Praxinoë me quondam, non Polybotae
Filia despexit.

With lines 24-25, ὦν γὰρ χ' ἄψησθε, θεαί, καλὰ πάντα ποιεῖτε, compare Baïf, Ecl. ii,

**Pucelles, commencez: où vous touchez, pucelles,
Où vous mettez la main toutes choses sont belles.**

Lines 24-37 are imitated in Leconte de Lisle's 'Péristère,

Kastalides ! chantez l'enfant aux brunes tresses,
Dont la peau lisse et ferme a la couleur du miel,
Car vous embellissez la louange, ô Déesses ! . . .
Et ses pieds sont luisants comme des osselets . . .
Il faut aimer. Le thon aime les flots salés,
L'air plaît à l'hirondelle, et le cytise aux chèvres,
Et l'abeille camuse aime la fleur des blés.
Pour moi, rien n'est meilleur qu'un baiser de ses lèvres.

Lines 26-27 are imitated by Daniel Heinsius, 'Ecloga Bucolica Nordovicum',

Te tenuem nigramque et multo sole perustam
Improbis affirmat Lycidas: mihi pulchra videris, etc.

With lines 30-31, *ἡ αἰξ τὰν κύτισον*, compare Ronsard, *Ecl.* iii (p. 66),

La chevre suit le thym, le loup la chevre suit,
. et l'estrangere grue
Suit au printemps nouveau le train de la charrue.

Lines 32-35, αἴθε μοι ἦς ὄσσα κροῖσον, are imitated by Ronsard, 'Elegie à Marie',

Si j'étois un grand roy, pour eternel exemple
De fidele amitié, je bastirois un temple . . .
De marbre parien seroit vostre effigie,
Vostre robe seroit à plein fond eslargie
De plis recamez d'or, etc.

Idyl XI. Paraphrased by Luigi Alamanni, Egloga vi. An interesting turn is given to lines 67-68, ἡ μήτηρ ἀδικεῖ με μόνα,

l'impia tua madre auara
Del tuo male e del mio uuol pur ch'io mora :
Ella mi biasma ogni hor, etc.

Paraphrased also by Ronsard, 'Le Cyclope amoureux', and Baif, Ecl. viii, 'Le Cyclope, ou Polyfeme amoureux' (in each case with details added from Ovid), by Mrs. E. B. Browning, 'The Cyclops', and Leconte de Lisle, 'Les Plaintes du Cyclope'. Translated by Leigh Hunt, 'The Cyclops.'

Lines 1-8 are imitated by Ronsard, 'Amours', ii. 58,

A Phebus, mon Grevin, tu es du tout semblable
De face et de cheveux, et d'art et de sçavoir, etc.

Lines 19-21 and 31-48 seem to be the model of Lorel's wooing in Ben Jonson's 'Sad Shepherd', ii. 1: "Deft mistress! whiter than the cheese new prest, Smoother than cream, and softer than the curds! Why start ye from me . . . And though my nose be camused . . . An hundred udders for the pail I have, That give me milk and curds, that make me cheese, To cloy the markets! . . . An aged oak . . . there grows afore my dur . . . Under whose shade I solace in the heat; . . . Twa trilland brooks . . . Before I pipe; for therein I have skill 'Bove other swineherds . . . Twa tyny urshins, and this ferret gay", etc.

Lines 42-49, ἀλλ' ἀφίκευσο ποθ' ἀμέ, are adapted and developed in Tennyson's "small sweet Idyl", toward the close of 'The Princess': "Come down, O maid, from yonder mountain height: What pleasure lives in height . . . For Love is of the valley, come thou down And find him; . . . and leave The monstrous ledges there to slope . . . but come; for all the vales Await thee; azure pillars of the hearth Arise to thee; the children call, and I Thy shepherd pipe", etc. Compare also line 38,

σπρίσθην θ' ὡς οὐτίς ἐπίσταμαι ὧδε Κυκλώπων.

Lines 44-48. The cavern with the shaded entrance and the neighboring stream reappear in Navagero's 'Iolas',

Est mihi praeuptis ingens sub rupibus antrum,
Quod croceis hederæ circum sparsere corymbis,¹
Vestibulumque ipsum silvestris obumbrat oliva:
Hanc prope fons, lapide effusus qui desilit alto,
Defertur rauco per levia saxa susurro, etc.

And Navagero is imitated in his turn by Ronsard, Ecl. ii,

J'ay pour maison un antre en un rocher ouvert,
De lambrunche sauvage et d'hierre couvert, . . .
Un meslier nouailleux ombrage le portail, . . .
Du pied naist un ruisseau dont le bruit delectable
S'enrouë, entre-cassé de cailloux et du sable, etc.,

and Baïf, Ecl. vi, 'Les Amoureux',

L'ay vn bel antre creux entaillé dans la pierre,
De qui la belle entree est toute de lierre

¹ Compare Virgil, Ecl. v. 7.

Couuerte çà et là: trois sourceons de belle eau
 Sourdans d'un roc percé font chacun son ruisseau,
 Qui d'un bruit enroué sur le grauois murmure, etc.

Idyl XII. The first nine lines are imitated in Marcantonio Flaminio's 'Ianthis',¹

Venisti tandem, tandem mea sola voluptas
 Venisti, et lucem miserae vitamque tulisti.
 Quantum vere nouo gaudet lasciua capella,
 Aestiuus quantum sitientes imbribus horti;
 Tantum, Mopse, tuo reditu laetatur Ianthis. . .
 Iam didici, quid sit iuuenem expectare morantem,
 Expectans vna vel nocte puella senescit.

Lines 3-9 are imitated in Navagero's 'Iolas',

Quantum ver formosum hieme est iucundius atra,
 Quantum mite pirum sorbis est dulcius ipsis,
 Quantum hirsuta capella suo setosior haedo,
 Quantum nocturnis obscuri vesperis umbris
 Puniceo exsurgens Aurora nitentior ortu est;
 Tantum, Amarylli, aliis mihi carior ipsa puellis.²

And, through Navagero, the passage is reechoed in Nicholas Grimoald's song 'A trueloue',

As fresh and lusty vere foule winter doth exceed:
 As morning bright, with scarlet sky, doth passe the euenings weed:
 As melow peares aboue the crabs esteemed be:
 So doth my loue surmount them all, whom yet I hap to se;

in Baïf's sixth Eclogue,

D'autant que du Printemps qui en May renouuelle
 La joyeuse verdure plus que l'yuer est belle:
 D'autant que du beau jour la lumiere qui luit
 Est plus claire que n'est l'obscurté de la nuit:
 D'autant Francine aussi tu me sembles plus belle
 Et plus chere tu m'es que nulle autre pucelle;

and in Ronsard's second Eclogue,

D'autant que du printemps la plaisante verdure
 Est plus douce aux troupeaux que la triste froidure,
 D'autant qu'un arbre enté rend un jardin plus beau
 Que le tige espineux d'un rude sauvageau . . .
 Et d'autant qu'au matin la belle aube qui luit
 Surmonte de clarté les ombres de la nuit;
 D'autant, ma Janeton, dessus toute pucelle
 Tu sembles à mes yeux plus gentille et plus belle.

¹ Carmina quinque illustrium Poetarum, Florentiae, 1552, p. 239.

² Compare Theocritus, Id. xviii. 26-28.

It is imitated also by George Buchanan, 'Desiderium Lutetiae',

Quantum ver hyemem, vietum puer integer aevi,
Ter viduam thalamis virgo matura parentem,
Quam superat Durium Rhodanus, . . .
Tantum omnes vincit Nymphas Amaryllis Iberas;

and by Daniel Heinsius, 'Thyrsis,'

tanto reliquis dilectior Aegon
quanto pulchra suo capra est villosior agno.

Lines 11-33 are imitated by Ronsard, 'Elegie à Marie' (vol. i. pp. 230-31),

D'âge en âge suivant, au retour de l'année,
Nous aurions près le temple une feste ordonnée, etc.

With lines 30-33 compare also Guarini's 'Pastor Fido', ii. 1, where a girl from Megara proposes a contest in kissing, with a garland for a prize.

The twelfth Idyl is translated by Leigh Hunt, 'The Lover'. For an early German version see Martin Opitz, 'Theocriti und Heinsii Aites' (Poet. Wälder, Bk. v).

Idyl XIII. Paraphrased by Marcantonio Flaminio, 'De Hercule et Hyla',

Quid mirare, tuo si regnat corde Lycinna,
Nec cessat tantis te cruciare malis?
Crede mihi, non solus amas, etc.

The opening lines, οὐχ ἄμιν τὸν Ἐρωτα μόνους ἔτεχ', are paraphrased in Ronsard's 'Elegie à Muret',

Non, Muret, non, ce n'est pas du jourd'huy
Que l'Archerot qui cause nostre ennuy
Cause l'erreur qui retrompe les hommes.
Non, Muret, non, les premiers nous ne sommes,
A qui son arc, d'un petit trait vainqueur,
Si grande playe a caché sous le coeur . . .
Hé qu'est-il rien que ce garçon ne brule?
Ce porte-ciel, ce tû-geans Hercule
Le sentit bien
Tousjours d'Iole il aimoit les beaux yeux,
Fust que le char qui donne jour aux cieux
Sortist de l'eau, ou fust que devalée
Tournast sa roue en la plaine salée, etc.

And they are imitated at the beginning of Tennyson's 'Godiva',

Not only we, the latest seed of Time,
New men, that in the flying of a wheel
Cry down the past, not only we, that prate
Of rights and wrongs, have loved the people well,
And loathed to see them overtax'd; but she
Did more, and underwent, and overcame,
The woman of a thousand summers back,
Godiva, wife to that grim Earl, who ruled
In Coventry.

The third line,

οὐχ ἅμιν τὰ καλὰ πρώτοις καλὰ φαίνεται ἡμεν,

is translated among Poliziano's Latin epigrams,

Pulchra quidem nobis haud primis pulchra uidentur.

Lines 16-60 are imitated in André Chénier's 'Hylas', and (very freely) in Leconte de Lisle's 'Hylas'.

With lines 34-35, *λειμών γάρ σφιν ἔκειτο*, compare Tennyson's afternoon picture, in 'The Lotos-Eaters', of a land with

many a winding vale
And meadow, set with slender galingale.

With lines 41-42 Fritzsche compares Io. Stigelius, 'Phryxus et Menalcas' (1553),

pingue chelidonium molli cum gramine mentae:
hoc oculis praesens, haec vocis idonea neruis:
atque eadem variis morbis medicina selinon.¹

Lines 58-60, *τρίς μὲν ὕλαν ἄνσεν*, are alluded to in the first eclogue of J. C. Scaliger's 'Nymphae Indigenae',

Ille ter inuisas pulsauit nomine syluas;
Hic mentita illi ter reddita vocis imago est,
Ter miser hic animum falsa spe lusit inanem.

Idyl XIV. Lines 5-6, *Πυθαγορικτάς, ὠχρὸς κἀνυπόδητος*, are imitated by André Chénier, 'La Jeune Locrienne',

un sage d'Italie,
Maigre, pâle, pensif, qui n'avait point parlé,
Pieds nus, la barbe noire, un sectateur zélé
Du muet de Samos qu'admire Métafonte.

¹I have not yet seen the Eclogues of Stigelius. This passage suggests, and Fritzsche definitely says, that they owe a good deal to Theocritus.

Idyl XV. Translated by Leigh Hunt, 'The Syracusan Gossips; or, The Feast of Adonis'. Lines 100ff. are paraphrased by Leconte de Lisle, 'Le Retour d'Adônîs'.

With lines 104-5, *βάρδισται μακάρων ὦραι φίλαι*, compare Tennyson, 'Love and Duty', 56,

The slow sweet hours that bring us all things good,

and the first of Mrs. Browning's 'Sonnets from the Portuguese',

I thought once how Theocritus had sung
Of the sweet years, the dear and wished for years,
Who each one in a gracious hand appears
To bear a gift for mortals, old or young.

With lines 120-22 compare Ronsard, Ecl. iii (Bellot's song),

Mille petits Amours ayant petites ailes
Voleront sur le lit comme és branches nouvelles
Des arbres au printemps revolent les oiseaux
Qui se vont esgayant de rameaux en rameaux.

Idyl XVI. 'E.K.' says of the October eclogue in Spenser's 'Shepherds Calender': "This Aeglogue is made in imitation of Theocritus his xvi. Idilion . . . And the lyke also is in Mantuane". But Spenser's debt to Theocritus is exceedingly slight, while his debt to Mantuan is very large—that is, to Mantuan's fifth Eclogue, 'De Consuetudine Diuitum erga Poetas.'

With line 32,

ὥσεί τις μακέλα τετυλωμένος ἐνδοθι χεῖρας,

H. Kynaston compares Tennyson, 'Maud', I. xviii. 4, "labour and the mattock-harden'd hand."

With lines 96-97, *ἀράχνια δ' εἰς ὄπλ' ἀράχλαι | λεπτὰ διαστήσαιντο*, compare the 'Chant de la Paix' in Remy Belleau's 'Bergerie',

et que l'araigne ourdisse
Sa fine trame és vuides morions.

Idyl XVII. With *ἐκλαγῆ . . . αλερός*, line 71, compare Tennyson, 'The Princess', iii. 90,

but I
An eagle clang an eagle to the sphere.

Idyl XVIII. Imitated in Ronsard's 'Epithalame', Odes, iv. 2,

Quand mon prince espousa
Jeanne, divine race, etc.

Translated, line for line, by Hugo Grotius, 'Silvae', Bk. iii.

With line 8, *ποσὰ περιπλέκτοισ*, compare Tennyson's charm of "woven paces", 'Merlin and Vivien', 328.

Lines 26-37 are imitated by Ronsard, Ecl. iii (Perrot's song),

Comme une belle rose est l'honneur du jardin,
Qui aux rais du soleil est éclos au matin,
Ainsy Claudine l'est de toutes les bergeres,
Et les passe d'autant qu'un pin fait les fougeres.
Nulle ne l'a gaignée à savoir façonner
Un chapelet de fleurs pour son chef couronner ;
Nulle ne sait mieux joindre au lys la fraische rose,
Nulle mieux sur la gaze un dessein ne compose
De fil d'or et de soye, et nulle ne sçait mieux
Conduire de Pallas les arts ingénieux.

Lines 43-48 are imitated by Ronsard, 'Le Voyage de Tours' (Perrot's song),

Je veux soigneusement ce coudrier arroser
Et des chapeaux de fleurs sur ses feuilles poser ;
Et avecq' un poinçon je veux dessus l'escorce
Engraver de ton nom les six lettres à force,
A fin que les passans, en lisant : Marion,
Facent honneur à l'arbre entaillé de ton nom.

With line 48, *σίβον μ' Ἑλένας φυτόν εἰμί*, Fritzsche compares Sannazaro, 'Arcadia', Egl. xii. 45,

Arbor di Phylli io son ; pastore, inclinati.

Lines 49-56 are quoted, and translated, in Burton's *Anatomy of Melancholy*, III. ii. 5. 5. And in an earlier section, on Artificial Allurements, there is an allusion to Helen's "sweet voice and musick", line 35.¹

Idyl XIX. Two early imitations of this little poem are quoted by A. Delboulle, 'Anacréon et les poèmes anacréontiques', Havre, 1891, pp. 128-29. One is by Colin Bucher, "poète angevin, mort en 1545, et qui, par conséquent, ne pouvait connaître le recueil de Henri Estienne"; the other is by Jacques Bereau. It is translated by J. C. Scaliger, under the title 'Ex Moscho *κηριοκλέπτης*' ,

Dum cellas vexat digitis, furtimque pusilla
Surripit argutus mella Cupido manu, etc.

¹ Here Burton quotes two lines about the sweet voice of Daphnis (Id. viii. 82-3), and refers them to this same Idyl.

There is another early version (c. 1547) by Fabio Benvoglianti,¹

Mentre da dolci favi fura del mel dolce Cupido,
Volta al ladro un'ape punge la bella mano, etc.;

and Cipollini cites a paraphrase by Luigi Alamanni, 'Amore punto dalle Api'. The poem is borrowed in Alciati's *Emblemata*, 101,

Alveolis dum mella legit, percussit Amorem
Furacem mala apes, etc.;²

and translated by Andrea Dazzi, who died in 1548,

Nactus apes furax populat dum mella Cupido,
Praedantis digitos aspera punxit apis.
Indoluit, perfiansque manum tellure repulsa
Matris Acidaliae constitit ante pedes, etc.³

It is imitated in Thomas Watson's 'Εκατομπαθία, 53, and the "annotation" mentions a Latin translation "by C. Vrcinus Velius in his Epigrammes:"

Nuper apis furem pupugit violenter Amorem, etc.

It is paraphrased also by Jacobus Micyllus, 'In furem Cupidinem.'⁴

Idyl XX. Translated by Baïf, Ecl. xii, 'Le Pastoureau de Theocrite'. Imitated in the fifth eclogue of J. C. Scaliger's 'Nymphae Indigenae':

"Irrisit tumido Macare mea basia vultu,
Sordidaque increpuit: nec spem fugitiva reliquit.
Pastor amas? ego pastoris labia horrida tangam?
Tangam ego? non faciam. quid enim cum sordibus urbi?
Abstineas atramque manum, setosaeque menta.
Me miseram: ut metuo, manus haec ne me inquinat atra. . .
Heu quam terribili feriunt tua lumina pulsu.
Rusticus es. teneras temerasti vocibus aures. . .
Sic ait, atque abiens gremium ter conspuat imum.
Ter spuit, et tacito secum ter murmurat ore. . .
Ergo alius videor nunc iam mihi. . .
Pastores ovium, teneraeque propaginis agnum,
Nonne ego sum magni Theramedae filius Alcon?
Quem vos formosum, quem Dii dixere beatum", etc.

¹ Quoted by Carducci, *La Poesia Barbara nei Secoli xv e xvi*, Bologna, 1881, p. 299.

² Lyons edition, 1564, p. 128.

³ *Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italorum*, Florence, 1719, vol. iv. p. 1.

⁴ *Anthologia poematum Latinorum aevi recentioris*, cur. A. Pauly, Tübingen, 1818, p. 174.

Imitated also in Hugo de Groot's 'Myrtilus': compare lines 19-32 with "Heu! quis mutavit mihi te Deus? . . . ne fallite nautae, Sumne alius quam nuper eram . . . Heu placeo Nymphis: at non tibi: sola marinos Despicias amplexus crudelis, et oscula vitas."

Lines 34-39 are imitated by Baldessar Castiglione, 'Stanze Pastorali', xii,

Vener ne' boschi accompagnar solea
Il suo amante, e là spesso s'addormia,
La Luna, ch'è su'n ciel sì bella dea,
Un pastorello per amor seguia, etc. ;

and lines 31-36 by Pietro Angelio Bargeo, Ecl. ii,

Quin etiam ingenti fastu nos despicias, omnem
Quod vitam in silvis inter spelaea ferarum,
Noctis et insomnes sub dio ducimus horas.
At non cultorem nemorum Venus aurea Adonim
Sprevit, et amplexus setosaeque brachia fugit.¹

Idyl XXI. With lines 1-2, 'Α πρῆν, Διόφαντε, compare the beginning of Remy Belleau's eclogue 'Le Pescheur',

Gentille Paureté, secours de nostre vie,
Nourrice des vertus, mere de l'industrie, etc.

The singer of 'Le Pescheur' explains "qu'vn vieil Marinier Sicilien luy auoit appris le suget de ceste complainte auec vne infinité d'autres"; and then he is persuaded to repeat another poem, 'Les Pescheurs'. But these two piscatory eclogues owe much more to Sannazaro than to Theocritus.²

With lines 8-12 Fritzsche compares Sannazaro's third Latin Eclogue,

Raraque per longos pendebant retia remos:
Ante pedes cistaeque leues hamique iacebant,
Et calami nassaeque et viminei labyrinthi.

And the same passage is imitated in Hugo Grotius' 'Myrtilus',

Est mihi namque domi non inuidiosa supellex,
Fiscellae virides, nodosaeque texta plagarum:
Filaque, et haerentes maculis humentibus algae,
Cum labyrintho plexis errore sagenis, etc.

¹ Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italarum, Florence, 1719, vol. i. p. 206.

² F. Torraca, *Gl' Imitatori stranieri di Jacopo Sannazaro*, Rome, 1882, pp. 54-58. Torraca smiles at one of Belleau's editors for calling the 'Arcadia' a poem. But even the Fritzsche-Hiller edition of Theocritus can speak of "das Gedicht Arcadia" (Leipsic, 1881, p. 25).

Idyl XXII. Freely used by Ronsard, Hymnes, i. 3, 'De Pollux et de Castor.'

Lines 20-22 were quoted in the 'Mantice' of Pontus de Tyard:

Deçà, delà, par l'air toute Nuée fuit:
Et derechef au Ciel l'une et l'autre Ourse luit:
Mesmes les deux Asnons, avec leur creche obscure
Se descourans à clair, de bonace future
Font signe aux Mariniers.¹

Lines 48-50, *ἐν δὲ μύες στερεοῖσι βραχίσιον*, have been compared with Tennyson's simile, 'Marriage of Geraint', 76,

And arms on which the standing muscle sloped,
As slopes a wild brook o'er a little stone,
Running too vehemently to break upon it.

Tennyson, however, resented this comparison, and maintained that his simile is different (Eversley ed., 1908, iii. 469).

Idyl XXIII. Paraphrased by Baïf, 'Amour Vangeur'; imitated by La Fontaine, Fables, xii. 24, 'Daphnis et Alcimadure.'

Lines 28-34, *καὶ τὸ ῥόδον καλὸν ἐστὶ*, are imitated by Pietro Angelio Bargeo, Ecl. ii,

Et rosa, purpureo quae se commendat honore
Mane virens, multo languescit pallida Sole.
Languescunt violae, languescunt lilia, cum se
Extulerunt primum et canas liquere pruinas.
Sic etiam, forma quae nunc anteire Napaeis
Diceris, amisso flebis mox flore iuventae.
Et veniet (mihi crede) dies, cum te quoque saevus
Uret amor, cum te dolor ulciscetur amantem.

Idyl XXIV. Lines 1-33 are paraphrased by Leconte de Lisle, 'L'Enfance d'Hèraklès'.

With lines 38-40 compare Joannes Auratus, 'De mirabili Reginae matris Viso',

Visa columna micans flammis de nocte parenti
Regis, materno cor micuitque metu,
Quale quod Alcmenae turbavit pectora visum,
Cum tener elisit monstra gemella puer.²

¹ Quoted in the Appendix of Marty-Laveaux's edition of Pontus de Tyard, Paris, 1875, p. 232.

² Ioannis Aurati Lemouicis Poetae et Interpretis Regii Poëmata, Lutetiae Parisior., 1586, p. 214. This is Jean Dorat, or Daurat, the first name in the French Pleiad. He wrote also a French version of this poem, which may be seen in Marty-Laveaux's edition, Paris, 1875, p. 20.

Idyl XXV. Lines 85 ff. are paraphrased by Leconte de Lisle, 'Hèraklès au Taureau'.

Idyl XXVI. With line 1, ἡ μαλοπάρανος Ἀγάνα, compare Tennyson, 'The Islet', "a bevy of Erores apple-cheek'd".

Lines 1-25 are paraphrased by Leconte de Lisle, 'La Mort de Penthée'.

Idyl XXVII. Translated by Baïf, Ecl. xviii, 'Le Satyreau', by Hugo Grotius, Silvae, iii, by André Chénier, 'Oaristys', by Le Brun, 'L'Oaristys, ou Dialogue amoureux entre Daphnis et une Bergère'.

With line 63,

Ἀρτεμι, μὴ νεμέσα σέο ῥήμασιν οὐκέτι πιστῇ,

compare Tasso, 'Aminta', i. 1,

e dissi sospirando:

Eccoti, Cintia, il corno, eccoti l'arco;

Ch'io rinunzio i tuoi studj e la tua vita.

Idyl XXVIII. Imitated by Ronsard, 'La Quenouille' (in the second book of his Amours).

With line 8, ἐλέφαντος πολυμόχθω, compare Tennyson's "laborious orient ivory", in the Prologue to 'The Princess'.

The name Theugenis, line 13, is borrowed by Leconte de Lisle, 'Les Bucoliastes'.

Epigram I, τὰ ῥόδα τὰ δροσέοντα. Translated by Hugo Grotius, Epigram. i, and by Leigh Hunt, 'Dedication of a Rural Spot and Altar'.¹

With line 6,

τερμίνθον τρώγων ἔσχατον ἀκρέμονα,

compare Spenser, 'Shepheards Calender', vii. 86, "and Teribinth, good for Gotes". Here 'E. K.' remarks that Theocritus speaks of terebinth, and then he misquotes this Epigram:

τερμίνθον τράγων εἶκατον ἀκρέμονα.

Epigram V, Ἀῆς ποτὶ τῶν Νυμφῶν. Translated by Leigh Hunt, 'The Rural Concert', and prettily turned in Leconte de Lisle's 'Symphonie',

Au nom des Muses! viens sous l'ombre fraîche et noire!

Voici ta double flûte et mon pektis d'ivoire.

Daphnis fera sonner sa voix claire, et tous trois,

¹ Grotius translated also Epigrams III, IV and XX. His four versions are borrowed in Daniel Heinsius' edition of Theocritus, 1604, Heinsius himself translating the remaining Epigrams. Leigh Hunt translated also Epigrams IV and V.

Près du roc dont la mousse a verdi les parois,
D'où Naïs nous écoute, un doigt blanc sur la lèvre,
Empêchons de dormir Pan aux deux pieds de chèvre.

ΕΙΞ ΝΕΚΡΟΝ ΑΔΩΝΙΝ. This poem of doubtful authorship is paraphrased by Antonio Minturno, 'De Adonide ab apro interempto'.¹ And Cipollini cites a translation by Benedetto Varchi (c. 1539).

BION.

Idyl I. 'Αδώνιδος 'Επιτάφιος. The first Idyl is paraphrased by Luigi Alamanni, Egloga, x, in the songs of Dafni and Dameta—with acknowledgments to the "Sicilian Poeta" from whom these songs were learned:

O fortunato uecchio, almo pastore
Per cui Sicilia eternamente ha uita,²
Et Syracuse tua perpetua lode, etc.

Compare, for example, lines 63-74 with the beginning of Dameta's song,

O santa Madre il bello Adone è morto.
O Vener bella ch'altrettanto pianto
Versi da gli occhi ch'ei dal fianco sangue,
Et ciascun nel cader la terra adorna,
Che quel fa bianchi fior, quest' altro rose.
Piangiamo Adon che'l bello Adone è morto.
Lascia ó bella Cyprignia il bosco homai
Ch'assai pianto & honor porta il tuo sposo.
Vedi hor composto Adon per nostre mani
Sopra il purpureo letto, il letto antico
Che gia fu di uoi due sostegno spesso.
Vedi ch'è morto, e morto è bello anchora
Tal che non morto anzi dormir ne sembra, etc.

Lines 42-53 and 64-66 are translated in Baif's ninth Eclogue:

Demeure, Adon, demeure, à fin que ie t'acole
Ceste derniere fois, et que ie me console
De ce dernier baiser: repren coeur mon Adon:
Que ie reçoie au moins de toy ce dernier don: . . .
Venus de ses doux yeux autant de pleurs larmoye

¹ Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italarum, Florence, 1719, vol. vi. p. 319.

² Compare Lowell's fine sentence, 'Harvard Anniversary', "The garners of Sicily are empty now, but the bees from all climes still fetch honey from the tiny garden-plot of Theocritus". Alamanni doubtless regarded the 'Αδώνιδος 'Επιτάφιος as the work of Theocritus. It was printed ('sine nomine') in the Aldine edition of the Idyls, 1495, and definitely ascribed to Theocritus in the Juntine edition, 1515.

Qu' Adon perd de son sang, qui de sa playe ondoie,
Et tout degoutte en terre, où du sang et des pleurs
A coup (miracle grand !) naissent de belles fleurs, etc.

Lines 64-66 and 79-85 are imitated in the second Eclogue of Remy Belleau's 'Bergerie':

Puis on voit sur le flanc dans le creux d'une oualle,
Sur un tapis de fleurs de couleur iaune et palle
Le pitoyable Adon estendu de son long,
Venus assise aupres, qui en larmes se fond,
Versant d'un oeil terni plus de pluye nouvelle,
Que ne coule de sang par la playe cruelle,
Et ne s'espand en vain: car de luy et des pleurs
Se naist une moisson de roses et de fleurs . . .
On voit autour du corps mille et mille Amoureux . . .
Les autres vont versant de cruches azurees
De l'eau pour le lauer, et de leurs doigts marbrins
Nettoient à l'enui les membres yuoirins . . .
Un autre est si bien mis sur le corps endormi . . .
Tant doucement et bien il esuente ce corps,
Qu'on voit presque mouuoir les membres desia morts.

This first Idyl of Bion is the chief model of Shelley's 'Adonais': "I weep for Adonais—he is dead! . . . For he is gone where all things wise and fair Descend. . . . He lies as if in dewy sleep he lay. . . . The quick Dreams, . . . mourn their lot . . . And one . . . fans him with her moonlight wings, . . . One from a lucid urn of starry dew Washed his light limbs, . . . Another clipt her profuse locks, . . . Another in her wilful grief would break Her bow and wingèd reeds, . . . 'Wake thou', cried Misery, 'childless Mother, rise Out of thy sleep, and slake in thy heart's core A wound more fierce than his, with tears and sighs'. . . . Out of her secret Paradise she sped, . . . Whose sacred blood, like the young tears of May, Paved with eternal flowers that undeserving way. . . . 'Stay yet awhile! speak to me once again! Kiss me, so long but as a kiss may live! And in my heartless breast and burning brain That word, that kiss, shall all thoughts else survive, With food of saddest memory kept alive . . . O gentle child, beautiful as thou wert, Why didst thou leave the trodden paths of men Too soon, and with weak hands though mighty heart Dare the unpastured dragon in his den?' "1

¹Shelley made actual translations (both incomplete) of the Lament for Adonis and the Lament for Bion. These are printed in H. B. Forman's edition, vol. iv. p. 232 and p. 235.

The poem is imitated by John Oldham, 'The Lamentation for Adonis', and paraphrased by Mrs. E. B. Browning, 'A Lament for Adonis'.

Idyl IV, Ἰξυρὰς ἐν κῶρος. Imitated by Ronsard, 'L'Amour Oyseau', and by Baïf, 'Amour oyseau'. It seems to be imitated also in Spenser's 'Shepheards Calender', iii. 61 ff., as 'E. K.' observed: "This Aeglogue seemeth somewhat to resemble that same of [Theocritus] wherein the boy likewise telling the old man, that he had shot at a winged boy in a tree, was by hym warned to beware of mischief to come."

Idyl V, Ἄ μεγάλα μοι Κύπρις. Paraphrased by Ronsard, Odes, v. 22; imitated by André Chénier, Idylles, vii, 'L'Amour et le Berger'; translated by Leigh Hunt, 'The Teacher Taught'. Ronsard's paraphrase is itself translated by Martin Opitz, Ode ix, 'Auss Ronsardts Erfindung'.

Idyl VI, Ταί Μοῖσαι τὸν Ἑρωτα. Translated by Ronsard, Odes, ii. 23,

Escoute, du Bellay, ou ¹ les Muses ont peur
De l'enfant de Venus, ou l'aiment de bon coeur,
Et tousjours pas à pas accompagnent sa trace, etc.,

by Baïf, 'De l'amitié d'Amour et des Muses',

Les Muses Soeurs Amour ne craignant pas
Bien que cruel, le suiuent pas à pas,
Et de coeur franc le cherissent, etc.,

and by André Chénier, Elégies, i. 6,

Mais non, le dieu d'amour n'est point l'effroi des Muses;
Elles cherchent ses pas, elles aiment ses ruses, etc.

Idyl XI, Ἑσπερε, τὰς ἑπαρὰς. Translated by Ronsard, Odes, iv. 17, and by Baïf, 'Diverses Amours',

De l'aimable Cypris ô lumiere doree, etc.

Borrowed by Baïf, 'Le premier des Meteores',

La Lune ne luit point, montre toy clair et beau.
Si par l'obscure nuit ie me suis mis en voye,
Ce n'est pour dérober, ce n'est que j'eusse joye
D'outrager le passant, c'est que suis amoureux, etc.

¹ Ronsard and Baïf are here following different texts. The former translates ἡ φοβέονται | ἡκ θυμῷ φιλέοντι, the latter οὐ φοβέονται.

Borrowed also by Io. Bapt. Amaltheus, 'Daphnis',

Non ego Amazonia munitus colla bipenni,
Qua nocturnus iter per devia lustra viator
Implicit, incursus meditor . . .
Nec mea furtivos vertam ad praesepia tauros . . .
Sed me, dum prono cogis vaga sidera coelo,
Iussit Amor dulci subducere lumina somno,
Atque Hyalen media furtim praevertere silva.¹

Translated by Antonio Mario (contemporary of Fracastoro), 'Ad Vesperam',

O sidus almae Cypridis,
O noctis aureum decus, etc.²

Imitated by André Chénier, 'Poésies antiques', ix, "Bel astre de Vénus", etc., and translated by Leigh Hunt, 'To the Evening Star'. The closing lines are imitated by Carducci, 'A Diana Trivia',

Non tra quest' ombre io la vendetta affretto
Già meditata; il casto raggio odiando,
Non io prorompo a invadere co'l brando
Cognato petto.
Io amo, etc.

MOSCHUS.

Idyl I, **Ἔρως δρᾶνέρης*. Translated into Latin verse by Poliziano, 'Amor fugitivus, ex Graeco Moschi,' and, through Poliziano, into Italian by Hieronymo Benivieni³ and into English by Spenser,⁴ though Spenser's translation is lost. Translated also by Baïf, 'A Mademoiselle Victoire' (Poèmes, v.), and by Barnabe Barnes (c. 1593), 'The first Eidillion of Moschus describing Love'. Closely imitated by Girolamo Angeriano, 'De seipso

¹Published in Broukhusius' edition of the Latin works of Sannazaro, Amsterdam, 1728, pp. 390-92.

²Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italarum, Florence, 1720, vol. vi. p. 250.

³'Amore fugituo di Mosco poeta graeco tradocto in lingua latina per M. Agnolo Politiano e di latina in toscana per Hyeronymo Beniuieni', Opere di Hieronymo Beniuieni, Firenze, 1519, p. 121.

⁴"But who liste more at large to behold Cupids colours and furniture, let him reade ether Propertius, or Moschus his Idyllion of *winged love*, being now most excellently translated into Latine, by the singuler learned man Angelus Politianus: whych worke I have seene, amongst other of thys Poets doings, very wel translated also into English Rymes", 'E. K.', on the 'Shepheards Calender', iii. 79.

et Venere',¹ and Antonio Ferreira, 'Amor fugido. De Moscho'; less closely by Sannazaro, 'De Amore fugitivo', Gil Vicente, 'Fragoa d'Amor', Clément Marot, 'D'Amour fugitiv, Invention de Marot', T. Tasso, 'Amore fuggitivo', Ben Jonson, 'Hue and Cry after Cupid', Gio. Battista Giraldi, 'Ad Venerem', and Benedetto Lampridio, 'De Venere et Cupidine fugitivo'.² And there is a translation by George Turberville (1567), "What time the ladie Venus lost hir little sonne", etc.

Sannazaro's imitation, which is very slight, is found in a ten-line Latin epigram (ii. 59). This is itself translated by Desportes, 'Les Amours d'Hippolyte', iii, and by an anonymous Italian writer (before 1539) quoted by Carducci, 'La Poesia Barbara nei Secoli xv e xvi', p. 256.

Idyl II, *Εὐρώπῃ ποτὲ Κύπρις*. Paraphrased by Baïf, 'Le Rauissement d'Europe' (Poèmes, ix).

The opening lines are imitated by George Buchanan, 'Fratres Fraterrimi', xxxiv:

Mane sub auroram nitidae vicinia lucis
Pallida venturo cum facit astra die,
Arctior irriguos somnus complectitur artus,
Demulcens placido languida membra sinu, etc.

The fancy of the strife between the two Continents, lines 8 ff., is borrowed by Ronsard, Odes, iii. 15,

La nuit que ce prince nouveau
De nos dieux augmenta la trope,
On vid autour de son berceau
Se battre l'Afrique et l'Europe, etc.

The description of Europa's basket, lines 44-62, is borrowed by Ronsard, Ecl. iii,

Tout ce gentil panier est portrait par-dessus
De Mercure et d'Io, et des cent yeux d'Argus.
Io est peinte en vache et Argus en vacher . . .
De son sang naist un paon, etc.,

and imitated by Ronsard, Odes, iii. 20, 'De la Défloration de Lede',

Et, studieuse des fleurs,
En sa main un panier porte
Peint de diverses couleurs,
Et peint de diverse sorte, etc.

¹ Poetae tres elegantissimi, Parisiis, 1582, pt. 2, pp. 17-18.

² Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italorum, Florence, 1719, v. 385 and vi. 29.

Lines 72-166 are translated by André Chénier (éd. Jouaust, 1884, pp. 291-93); and the whole poem is imitated by Le Brun, 'Europe', and Leconte de Lisle, 'L'Enlèvement d'Européia'.

Idyl III, Βίωνος Ἐπιτάφιος. The third Idyl is imitated in the eleventh Eclogue of Sannazaro's 'Arcadia'. The opening lines of the Italian poem are closely copied from the Greek, and the refrain is borrowed—"Ricominciate, o Muse, il vostro pianto". Compare (with line 3) "Piangi, colle sacrato, opaco, e fosco, . . . Piangete Faggi, e Quercie alpestri, . . . Lacrimate voi fiumi ignudi, . . . (6-7) Piangi, Hyacintho, le tue belle spoglie, E raddoppiando le querele antiche Descrivi i miei dolor nelle tue foglie . . . (99) Ai, ai, seccan le spine, e poi ch'un poco Son state a ricovrar l'antica forza, Ciascuna torna, e nasce al proprio loco. Ma noi, poichè una volta il ciel ne sforza, . . . (116) Felice Orfeo, . . . (70) Ma tu, ben nato avventuroso Fiume, . . . Quel fu'l primo dolor, quest' è'l secondo. . . (104) quel duro eterno inexcitabil sonno" (εὐδομεσ εὖ μάλα μακρὸν ἀτέρμονα νήγρετον ὕπνον).¹

It is paraphrased bodily by Luigi Alamanni, Egloga ii, a lament for Cosmo Rucellai—the "Tuscan Orpheus" for whom the "Tuscan river" now mourns as of old it mourned for Dante and Petrarch and Boccaccio. Compare, for example, lines 99-104, αἰαῖ, τὰι μαλάχαι, with

Le liete rose, le fresche herbe e uerdi,
Le uiolette, i fior uermigli e' i persi
Bene han la vita lor caduca e frale,
Ma l'aure dolci, i sol benigni e l'acque
Rendon gli spirti lor che d'anno in anno
Tornan piu che mai belli al nuouo aprile,
Ma (lassi) non virtù, regni, o thesoro
À noi render porrian quest' alma luce.²

It is imitated in Castiglione's 'Alcon'.³ With lines 26-29 compare

Heu miserande puer! tangunt tua funera divos.
Per nemora agricolae flentes videre Napaeas,
Panaque, Silvanumque, et capripedes Satyriscos.

¹ The last two Prose and Egloghe of the 'Arcadia' seem to have been written later than the rest of the work. At any rate, they were not published till 1504. The Lament for Bion was printed (without Moschus' name) in the Aldine edition of Theocritus, Venice, 1495, fol. xx, i.

² Lines 37-44 are parodied in Alamanni's Latin eclogue 'Melampus', to describe the grief of a Nymph at the death of a favorite hound, Carmina illustrium Poetarum Italorum, Florence, 1719, vol. i. p. 451.

³ Opere Volgari e Latine del Conte Baldessar Castiglione, ed. Volpi, Padua, 1733, pp. 335-38.

With lines 31-32 compare

Arboribus cecidere comae, spoliataque honore est
Silva suo; solitasque negat pastoribus umbras.

Lines 65-66 are echoed in

Heu miserande puer! tecum solatia ruris,
Tecum Amor, et Charites periere, et gaudia nostra.

With lines 99-104, *alaï, tal' maláχai*, compare

Vomeribus succisa suis moriuntur in arvis
Gramina: deinde iterum viridi de cespite surgunt:
Rupta semel non deinde annectunt stamina Parcae.

It is imitated in Clément Marot's 'Complainte de Madame Loyse de Savoye' (1531). Compare (with line 32), "Fueilles et fruitz des arbres abbatirent; . . . (37) Et les Daulphins bien jeunes y pleurerent. . . . (23-24) Bestes de proye et bestes de pasture, Tous animaulx Loyse regretterent, . . . (46-48) Sur l'arbre sec s'en complaint Philomene; L'aronde en faict cris piteux et trenchans; . . . (58) Nymphes et dieux de nuict en grand' destresse La vindrent veoir", and (with lines 99 ff.),

D'où vient cela qu'on voit l'herbe sechante
Retourner vive alors que l'esté vient,
Et la personne au tumbeau trebuschante,
Tant grande soit, jamais plus ne revient?

And, through Marot, some of Moschus' imagery is repeated in Spenser's 'Shepherds Calender', xi. Compare lines 29-32 with

The faded lockes fall from the loftie oke,
The flouds do gaspe, for dryed is theyr sourse,
And flouds of teares flowe in theyr stead perforce:¹
The mantled meadows mourne . . .
The feeble flocks in field refuse their former foode, etc.;

and lines 99 ff. with

Whence is it, that the flouret of the field doth fade,
And lyeth buried long in Winters bale;
Yet, soone as spring his mantle hath displayde,
It floureth fresh, as it should never fayle?
But thing on earth that is of most availe,
As vertues branch and beauties budde,
Reliven not for any good.

¹ καὶ ὕδατα δάκρυα γέντο. This is not in Marot, who says only, "Plusieurs ruyssaux tous à sec demourerent."

Two passages are imitated by Antonio Ferreira, Egloga vii.
Compare lines 37-44, *οὐτόσον εἰναλίσαισι παρ' αἰόσι*, with

Não tanto o Delphim lá no mar chorava,
Nao tanto Philomela lamentou,
Não tanto Ariadne aos ventos se queixava,
Nem tanto Cisue em morte pranteou . . .
Quanto Daphnis choráram, e nós choremos,
Versos a Daphnis, doces versos demos ;

and lines 99-104, *αἰαῖ, ταί μαλάχαι*, with

Ah, que a Malva, e a Ortiga reverdece ;
D'hum dia n'outro torna outra herva nova,
Séca-se o campo, com Abril florece,
Mayo cad'anno a pintura renova . . .
Nós pera sempre desaparecemos.

Lines 26-56 are paraphrased by Pietro Angelio Bargeo, Ecl.
iv, a lament for Benedetto Varchi,

Te Satyri Panesque leves te, candide Varchi,
Suspirant Dryades, atraque in veste Napaeae.
Inque antris specubusque imis in vallibus Echo
Muta silet, queriturque tacens secum ipsa, doletque
Quod nequeat dulces audire ac reddere voces
Laeta tuas,
Quas olim numeris volucres mulcebat amatis,
Quas olim in silvis versus cantare docebat
Luscinias, nunc illae inter fruticeta sedentes
Certatim ad luctus lamentaque dura loquaces
Hortantur picas, etc.

Lines 28-32 are imitated by Baïf, 'Du trepas de Marguerite de
Valoys Royne de Nauarre' (Poèmes, vii),

Qui ne veit nos forests de leur gay vestement
Adonc se denuer? qui n'ouit hautement
Redoubler les rochers en clameurs violentes
Les miserables crïs de nos plaintes dolentes
D'un egal sentiment?
Quel fleuve, quel ruisseau ne veit-on ondoyer
Plus trouble, et plus enflé du piteux larmoyer
Des Nymphes se plaignans aux sources des fontaines?

The poem is imitated again in the "Doric lay" of Milton's
'Lycidas'. Compare lines 1-7 with

return Sicilian muse,
And call the vales, and bid them hither cast
Their bells and flowerets of a thousand hues . . .
To strow the laureate hearse where Lycid lies,

and lines 28-32 with "Thee, shepherd, thee the woods, and desert caves . . . And all their echoes mourn."

It is imitated also in Shelley's 'Adonais': "Most musical of mourners, weep again! . . . And others came, . . . All he had loved, . . . lamented Adonais. . . . Lost Echo sits amid the voiceless mountains, And feeds her grief with his remembered lay, . . . Grief made the young Spring wild, and she threw down Her kindling buds, . . . Thy spirit's sister, the lorn nightingale, Mourns not her mate with such melodious pain; Not so the eagle, . . . Ah, woe is me! Winter is come and gone, But grief returns with the revolving year. The airs and streams renew their joyous tone; etc., . . . Our Adonais has drunk poison—oh What deaf and viperous murderer could crown Life's early cup with such a draught of woe?"

Lines 102-104, ἄμμες δ' οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρτεροί, οἱ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες, are echoed in Wordsworth's 'After-Thought (Duddon)':

While we, the brave, the mighty, and the wise,
We Men, who in our morn of youth defied
The elements, must vanish.

Compare, further, with lines 99 ff., the elaborate passage in Matthew Arnold's 'Thyrsis': "Soon will the high midsummer pomps come on, Soon will the musk carnations break and swell, . . . But Thyrsis never more we swains shall see". And with lines 115-126 compare Arnold's next two stanzas: "But when Sicilian shepherds lost a mate, Some good survivor with his flute would go, Piping a ditty sad for Bion's fate; . . . And flute his friend, like Orpheus, from the dead. Oh, easy access to the hearer's grace When Dorian shepherds sang to Proserpine! For she herself had trod Sicilian fields, . . . She loved the Dorian pipe, the Dorian strain", etc.

The whole poem is paraphrased by John Oldham, 'Bion. A Pastoral. In Imitation of the Greek of Moschus, bewailing the Death of the Earl of Rochester. Ann. 1680'; and translated by Leigh Hunt, 'On the Death of Bion, the Herdsman of Love'.

After all its influence upon the greater literatures of the modern world, the Lament for Bion has been pronounced "ein unbe-deutendes Gedicht".¹ This is the verdict of Professor Wilamowitz, who lately edited Moschus for the Oxford Classical

¹ Bion von Smyrna, Adonis, deutsch und griechisch, Berlin, 1900, p. 9.

II.—LINGUISTIC NOTES ON THE SHĀHBĀZGARHI AND MANSEHRA REDACTIONS OF ASOKA'S FOURTEEN-EDICTS.

FIRST PART.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION.

In the following investigations certain facts are presupposed, to wit: that the language of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions is practically identical (see Johansson, *Der dialect der sogenannten Shāhbāzgarhi-redaktion*, i, p. 123, 9 of the reprint, and that the dialect of the 'Māgadhan' original, of which the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions are translations, has left linguistic traces in these (see Johansson, *ibidem* ii, p. 26; Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit*, p. 109).

As the solutions of the problems we are to take up depends upon these postulates, it is clearly our duty before proceeding to the problems themselves, to indicate to the reader the general character of the linguistic traces left by the 'Māgadhan' original, and how they are to be recognized.

It is agreed that the dialect of the 'Māgadhan' original of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions of Asoka's Fourteen-Edicts was essentially the same as the dialects of the Dhauli, Jaugada, and Kālsī recensions of these edicts, the Delhi-Sivalik version of the Pillar-Edicts, etc. These are styled 'Māgadhan' because Indic *r* appears as *l*, and original final *-as* becomes *-e* in all of them, but the term 'Māgadhan' must not be confused with the Māgadhi of the Prākṛit grammarians: this has a number of special features not shared by the dialects called 'Māgadhan'. It should be noted, however, that although the dialect of the Kālsī redaction is essentially 'Māgadhan', yet it possesses some very marked characteristics of its own.¹

The linguistic traces left by the 'Māgadhan' original in the two versions we are studying are to be recognized in the following way: Where we have two products in the Shāhbāzgarhi and

¹ Franke also recognizes that the dialect of the Kālsī recension varies considerably from the 'Māgadhan'. In edicts i-ix the dialect is practically pure 'Māgadhan'; in edicts x-xiv the local peculiarities are prominent. The other 'Māgadhan' dialects differ from one another in a few minor points.

Mansehra redactions from one Indic sound (or two combinations of sounds corresponding to one Indic combination), and two inflectional forms corresponding to one Indic inflectional form, when we find one of these products and one of the inflectional forms—and no other phonetic product or inflectional form—in the Dhauli recension, etc., corresponding to the same Indic sound (or combinations of sounds) and inflectional form, then the phonetic product or inflectional form found in the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions but also in the Dhauli version, etc. is to be considered as due to the dialect of the 'Māgadhan' original. (The same principle holds good in determining the 'Māgadhisms' of the Gīrnār version of the Fourteen-Edicts, etc.). For example, Indic *r* becomes *l* in the dialects of the Dhauli, Jaugada and Kālsī recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts, the various redactions of the Pillar-Edicts, but remains *r* in the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra texts in the vast majority of cases: hence the few isolated instances where we find *l* for Indic *r* in these two texts, can be ascribed with certainty to the influence of the 'Māgadhan' original; a case in point is Shb. and Mans. *sala-* (Sanskrit *sāra-*). Again, corresponding to Sanskrit *sarva-* we find mostly *savra-* (merely graphically for *sarva-*) in the Shb. text, though also *sava-* (graphically for *sarva-*): but as soon as we see that *sava-*, and *sava-* only, is the correspondent to Sanskrit *sarva-* in the Dhauli and Jaugada recensions, we are assured that *sava-* of the Shāhbāzgarhi text is due to the 'Māgadhan' original. The fact that in the Mansehra text *savra-* is the sole correspondent to Sanskrit *sarva-* is an absolutely clinching argument for this view. Yet we would be reasonably certain without this support. Similarly the locative singular of *a-* stems in *-asi* is a 'Māgadhimism', while that in *-aspi* is native to the dialect of the two texts that we are investigating. Likewise the optative *yeham* in the Mansehra redaction is a 'Māgadhimism', see Franke, l. c., 114. A number of other cases could be easily cited, but for our purpose these are sufficient.

There is a point concerning these 'Māgadhisms' that is of special interest to us in our investigations, namely, it is a well recognized fact that in the Mansehra redaction certain 'Māgadhisms' have completely supplanted the native forms; thus the 'Māgadhan' gerundive termination *taviya-* has completely usurped the place of the native *tava-*; similarly *-jin-* in the weakest cases of *raja* that of native *-ñ-*; also 'Māgadhan' *-e* for

Indic *-as* is found to the exclusion of native *-o*. These cases are made certain by the testimony of the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction; without this we would be forced into believing these 'Māgadhisms' really represented the true dialectic forms of the Mansehra text. In precisely the same manner I hope to show that certain 'Māgadhisms' in the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction usually considered as representing the true dialect, have in reality either totally or very nearly ejected the true vernacular forms. The evidence for this will be found in the testimony of the Mansehra version.

Another salient feature of these 'Māgadhisms' is that sometimes only parts of a word show 'Māgadhan' influence. Examples are Shāhbāzgarhi *spagam*, *savatra*; Mansehra *kayaṇa-pakaraṇasi*. *Spagam* is for native *spagram* (so Mans.; *gr* graphically for *rg*; Sanskrit *svarga*-) altered by 'Māgadhan' *svagam* [*g* graphically for *gg*; Jaugaḍa and Kālsī *svagam*, cf. Dhāuli (*svagasa*)]. *Savatra* is for *savratra* (so Mansehra always) influenced by 'Māgadhan' *savata* (so Dhāuli and Jaugaḍa). Similarly *kayaṇa-* is for *kalāṇa-*, and *pakaraṇasi* is for *prakaraṇaspi*.

Allied to the feature mentioned in the preceding paragraph is the curious blend found in *dhraṇma*- which occurs a few times in both Shb. and Mans. This is a blend of *dhrama*- (that is *dharma*-; Sanskrit *dharma*-) which is the regular form native to the dialect of these texts, occurring a number of times, and 'Māgadhan' *dhaṇma*- (so Dhāuli, Jaugaḍa, Kālsī, and the different recensions of the Pillar-Edicts). In these notes I hope to show that other blends of this character occur.

Thus far I have treated only the 'Māgadhisms' which have previously been recognized as such with the exception of the loc. sing. in *-asi* as contrasted with that in *-aspi*. It will be noticed that 'Māgadhan' influence has been shown mostly in the consonantism of words; and in the vocalism of the final syllables only. Per se there is no reason why we should not find 'Māgadhan' influence in the vocalism of syllables other than final, and Franke's language certainly implies the recognition of this principle. Yet to my knowledge, hitherto no examples of this have been pointed out,¹ and as I shall make use of this in the solution of a certain problem, it is well to give a concrete example to establish the general theory. This is most easily done by selecting an

¹ An error; two cases have been pointed out: see above; cf. also JAOS. xxx.

illustration from the Gīrnār redaction of the Fourteenth-Edicts. The native word corresponding to Sanskrit *bhavati* is *bhavati* but 'Māgadhan' *hoti* is found three times. We have accordingly 'Māgadhan' influence in the vocalism of a syllable other than final. That *hoti* is a 'Māgadhism' is made certain by the invariable correspondent to Sanskrit *bhavati* in the Dhāuli, Jaugaḍa, and Kālsī recensions, namely, *hoti*. Incidentally I remark that 'Māgadhan' *hoti* replaces native *bhoti* in the *Shāhbāzgarhi* recension a couple of times, but in the Mansehra version it has practically wiped out the native form, *bhoti* occurring but once, namely, at xii. 9.¹ Another example is *guru-susāsā*, G. xiii. 3; cf. Dhāuli *susāsā* (i. e. *sussāsā*). The native word is *susrūsā*, iv. 7 (twice), x. 2, xi. 2.² The form *susrūsā* at G. iii. 4 is a blend of the *dhraimma*-type. (*Susuṃsā* at G. xiii. 3 is a blunder for *susūsā*, i. e. *sussūsā*, with 'Māgadhan' -s- for -sr-.)

It remains for me to say that Buehler's editions of the *Shāhbāzgarhi*, Mansehra, Gīrnār, and Kālsī redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts, the various recensions of the Pillar-Edicts in *Epigraphia Indica* ii, his edition of the Dhāuli version of the Fourteen-Edicts in *ZDMG.* xxxix, and his edition of the Jaugaḍa text of the same edicts in *ZDMG.* xxxvii, xl, and his edition of the Detached-Edicts of Dhāuli and Jaugaḍa, *ibidem* xli, have been made the basis of these investigations.

1. THE HISTORY OF INDIC SIBILANTS *s*, *ś*, *ṣ*.

It is conceded by all that there exist symbols for the sibilants *s*, *ś*, and *ṣ* in the Mansehra and *Shāhbāzgarhi* redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts, but there is some discussion as to whether the

¹ It is quite true that in Pāli we have the doublets *bhavati* and *hoti*; but this is a case of dialect-mixture exactly as in the case of *attha*-, *aṭṭha*-, (*Skt. artha*-): see below, p. 297. Windisch has properly emphasized the fact that Pāli is a literary language only, and does not represent any one vernacular.

² Observe also Delhi-Sivalik *susūsāyā* at vii.² 8 (twice) as contrasted with *susūsāyā* at Delhi-Sivalik i. 4, Allahabad i. 2; *susūsāyā* at Radhia i. 3, Mathia i. 3. As I have pointed out before (*IF.* xxiii, p. 248), the dialect of the seventh edict of the Delhi-Sivalik version of the Pillar-Edicts differs somewhat from the other edicts of this text. I shall try to explain the short *ā* of the Gīrnār and Delhi-Sivalik words as opposed to the long *ā* of the other Asokan dialects and Sanskrit on a future occasion; for our present purpose it is sufficient to establish the empirical fact that we have *ā* in the dialect of G. and DS. [See the next No. of *JAOS.*]

three symbols are not merely graphic representatives of merely one sound, namely dental *s*; and also if it is granted that the three sibilants are really native to the dialects of the texts under discussion there is question as to how they correspond to the Indic sibilants.

Senart, J.A. Juillet-Août, 1886, pp. 74, 75 holds that all three sibilants are used indiscriminately, and so must be considered as standing for dental *s*. Johansson, Shb., sections 14, 18, 48, also supports this view, though at the end of section 48 he queries if it may not be that only the palatal and lingual sibilants have fallen together.

Franke, GN., 1895, p. 538 made a great step in advance in declaring that the use of the three sibilants in the texts of Mans. and Shb. was as a whole in accordance with the etymology of a given word. This, however, is not saying that the dialects of the Mansehra and Shāhbāzgarhi redactions actually possessed three distinct sibilants *s*, *ś*, and *ṣ*. From his language one might infer that the sibilants had indeed fallen together in one sound, i. e., *s*, but that the correct historical spelling had in general been maintained, if it were not for his well-known hostility to Senart's theory of historical and learned spelling in the inscriptions of India (see BB. xvii, p. 86 ff.; Pāli und Sanskrit, p. 53, footnote 10). Later, in his Pāli und Sanskrit, he definitely ascribed all three sibilants to the dialects of the Mansehra and Shāhbāzgarhi texts, but said that in certain cases dental *s* stood for Indic *s*, *ś*, *ṣ*: see pp. 54, 55, and 93. But it will be observed that no phonetic law or laws are stated that govern the unusual correspondence in these cases, save that Mans. and Shb. *st* correspond to Sanskrit *ṣṭh*. Why is it, for example, that we have the locative plural *yesu* at Shb. xiii. 4, but the locative plurals *am̐teṣu*, *anatheṣu*, *nagareṣu*, etc.; or why is the Indic palatal sibilant kept in *śramaṇa-*, *paśu-*, *Priyadraśi*, etc., but appears as dental *s* in *anusocan[am̐]*, Shb. xiii. 2? To such questions no answer is given. Certain other cases taken up below are also passed over in silence. That is to say that the charge of promiscuous use of the sibilants was not disproved. Very probably Franke expected to make proper explanation in his promised Pāli Grammar, but over six years have elapsed and the book has not yet appeared, and—as far as I know—there is no likelihood of this occurring in the immediate future. Under these circumstances it is permissible for another to examine the subject anew.

It must be said that Franke was on the right track. The dialects of the Mansehra and Shāhbāzgarhi redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts do possess the three sibilants *s*, *ś*, *ṣ*, and these do correspond as a whole to the Indic sibilants of the same class. There are, however, certain phonetic laws which have a modifying influence. For the most part Johansson anticipated them, but was doubtful whether we had to deal with a graphic representation or a phonetic process, and in one case, namely, the treatment of *ṣ* + *i*, *iṣ* (ii. p. 5) was wrong as Sørensen¹ (Om Sanskrit, p. 286) and Franke (Pāli und Sanskrit, p. 98) saw; but they too were not absolutely right. That the dialects of Mans. and Shb. are more archaic in this matter than the dialects of other inscriptions of Asoka need cause no concern. For in certain other respects their dialects are more archaic. Thus Indic *r* is not assimilated to an immediately preceding or following mute or sibilant, an immediately following nasal or *v*²;

¹Sørensen apparently also held that the dialects of Shb. and Mans. possessed the three sibilants *s*, *ś*, *ṣ*; but gave away his case by admitting that they were used inconsistently. I regret exceedingly that I could only use the French résumé. [Reference unverified.]

²Such is the view of Johansson. But as *vaṣa-* is found 8 times in Shb., and 7 times in Mans. as the correspondent to Sanskrit *varṣa-*, there being no other correspondent in either Shb. or Mans., and as *kaṣati* and *kaṣaṁti* as the equivalent of **karṣiati* and **karṣiānti* respectively (cf. Skt. *kariṣyati*, *kariṣyanti*), there being no other correspondents to the prototypes cited, occur a few times in both Shb. and Mans., it would seem as if in the case of *-arṣ-* and *-arṣi-* the *r* was assimilated, and the forms cited accordingly those proper to the dialects of Mans. and Shb. If we had *vaṣa-* alone to deal with, we might attribute the lack of an *r* to the influence of the 'Māgadhan' original, especially if *vraṣa*; i. e., *varṣa*, at Shb. iv. 10 were certain; cf. *paṣaṁḍa-* beside *praṣaṁḍa-* (i. e. *parṣ-*) in both Mans. and Shb. (It so happens that the anusvara is graphically omitted in Mans.). But it should be noticed that the so-called 'Māgadhan' versions have *kachati* and *kachaṁti* respectively as the correspondents to *kaṣati* and *kaṣaṁti*. There can be no question therefore of, at any rate, direct 'Māgadhan' influence in *kaṣati* and *kaṣaṁti*. It is, of course, possible to assume that *kaṣati* and *kaṣaṁti* are hyper-Māgadhisms, and unless this is done, it is difficult to escape assuming the phonetic law suggested above. If it is queried why *arṣ* is treated differently than *arī*, in reply it may be said that in the dialect of the Gīrnār recension of the Fourteen-Edicts *arṣ* and *arī* are also treated differently: see Michelson, IF. xxiv, pp. 53, 54 and JAOS. xxx.

The fact that *r* is retained before consonants, is disguised by the writing of Shb. and Mans.; e. g., *dhrama-* is merely graphical for *dharma-*, *draṣana-* for *darśana-*, *saura-* for *sarva-*, *athra-* for *artha-*, *vraṣaspi* for *varcaspi* (cf. Skt. *varcas-*), etc. There are some who deny that in these cases the *r* was really

whereas in the dialect of the Gīrnār version of the Fourteen-Edicts Indic *r* is kept after an immediately preceding mute or sibilant and before an immediately following *v*; but is assimilated to an immediately following mute, nasal, or sibilant; and in the dialects of the Kālsī, Dhauli, and Jaugada recensions of the

pronounced immediately before the other consonant, and affirm that the spelling indicates the true pronunciation. For the literature on this point see Johansson, *Der dialect der sogenannten Shāhbāzgarhi redaction*, sections 4 and 17. Buehler, *El. i*, p. 17, should also be consulted. I may briefly point out why in my opinion this view is untenable. Why is *r* treated differently before dental and guttural mutes than it is before palatal and labial mutes? Observe Mans. *vadhrite* (Sanskrit *vardhita-*), *vagreṇa* (Sanskrit *vargena*), *vracaspi* (transfer to the *a*-declension, cf. Sanskrit *varcas-*), Shb. *grabhagaraspi*, Mans. *grabhagarasi* (Sanskrit *garbhāgāra-*). This puzzling divergence vanishes if a merely graphic caprice is assumed; i. e., that *vadhrite* stands for *vardhite*, *vracaspi* for *varcaspi*, etc. For why have we *pruva-* as the correspondent to Sanskrit *pūrva-*, but *savra-* as the equivalent of Sanskrit *sarva-*? And if the reading *srava-* at Shb. vi. 16 be accepted, how is this apparent doublet of *savra-* to be explained? It is absolutely certain that *srava-* corresponds to Skt. *sarva*. The only way out of the difficulty is to assume that *pruva-* is merely graphical for *pūrva-*, and that *savra-* and *srava-* are merely orthographic variants to express *sarva-*. Observe also Mans. *kraṭaviye* corresponds to Skt. *kartavya-*, and Shb. *kiṭri* to Skt. *kīrti-*; similarly Shb. *vistriṭena* = Sanskrit *vistṛtēna*, and Shb. *kiṭṛam* = Sanskrit *kīrtam*. These are only explicable on the theory that *kraṭaviye*, *kiṭri*, *vistriṭena*, and *kiṭṛam* are merely graphical for *kartaviye*, *kīrti*, *vistṛtēna*, and *kīrtam* respectively. Otherwise we would have a perplexing different phonetic treatment of *r* before the same sound, namely, *ṭ*. Mansehra *driḍhra-* at vii. 33 is highly instructive if the true reading. It is a blunder for *driḍha-* or *diḍhra-*, in either case merely graphical for *divḍha-* (Sanskrit *divḍha-*) as is shown by Gīrnār *daḍha-*. Mansehra *karṭa-* (Sanskrit *kṛta-*) at v. 24 is also very weighty in this connection. Similarly *paṭri* on the sixth edict of Shb. (for *praṭi* elsewhere) is pertinent evidence in showing that the consonant to which *r* is attached is only a matter of graphic convenience. The fact that at Mans. v. 24 we have *viyapraṭa* as the correspondent to Shb. *viyapaṭra* at v. 13 is a decisive argument in favor of this view. Their Sanskrit counterpart is *vyāpṛtās*, and they can only be explained as both being merely graphical for *viyapaṭra*.

There are some who will cite Pāli *gadabha-* (Sanskrit *gardabha-*) in support of the contention that Mansehra *spagraṃ*, etc., represents the real pronunciation. It is quite true that according to Pāli phonetics we should expect **gaddabha-* or **gaḍḍabha-* as the correspondent to Sanskrit *gardabha-*, and *gadabha-* must be a loan-word from some dialect in which metathesis of *r* preceding consonants took place. I do not deny that such dialects may have existed, but I deny that evidence of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra redactions warrants us in assuming this phenomenon occurred in the dialects of these two texts.

Fourteen-Edicts as well as in the dialects of the six redactions of the Pillar-Edicts Indic *r* is assimilated to an immediately preceding or following mute or sibilant, an immediately following nasal or *v*. (Apparent exceptions to the above are 'Māgad-hisms'.)

The modifying phonetic laws hinted at in the above paragraph are:

- (1) Initial *ś* is dissimilated to *s* if the next syllable begins with *ś*.
- (2) Medially between vowels *s* is assimilated to a preceding *ś*.
- (3) Corresponding to Aryan *śt(h)* [Sanskrit *ṣt(h)*] we have *st*.¹
- (4) *ṣi*² and *ṣi* become *śś*, of course written *ś*. Franke and Sørensen are in error when they assume that *ś* (not *śś*) is the phonetic product. Māgadhī Prākṛit *manuśśa-* (Sanskrit *manuṣyā-*) is convincing proof of this.

Examples are: Shb., Mans. *suśruṣa* (written so several times) = Sanskrit *śuśrūṣā*; Shb. *dhra[ma]n[u]śaśanaṁ*, Mans. *dhra-manu[śa]śana* = Skt. *dharma + anuśāsanam*. Shb., Mans. *manuśa-* = Skt. *manuṣyā-*; Shb. *anuśaśiśanti*, Mans. *anuśa-śiśa[n]ti* = Skt. *anuśāśiṣyanti*; Mans. *hapeśati* = Skt. *hāpa-yiṣyati*; Shb. *asta-* (so probably in the thirteenth edicts) = Skt. *aṣṭa-*; Shb. *tistiti* = Sanskrit **tiṣṭhitvī*, cf. Mans. *[ti]stitu - a tu-gerund*.

¹ It should be noticed that in the dialect of the Gīrnār redaction of the Fourteen-Edicts that *st* is the correspondent to Sanskrit *ṣt* and *ṣh*. It is possible that the law that an original palatal sibilant converts a following *st* to *st* in the dialect of Gīrnār should be connected with law (2) stated above, and similarly Gīrnār *st* as the correspondent to Skt. *ṣt(h)* with law (3). The law then should be stated: A palatal sibilant converts a following dental sibilant to a palatal one in the dialects of G., Shb., Mans., the combination *st* subsequently becoming *st* exactly as pre-Aryan *st* became Aryan *st*. Then this secondary *st* had the same history in the separate dialects as Aryan *st(h)*, i. e., G. *st*, Shb., Mans. *st*. Secondary intervocalic *ś* had the same history as original intervocalic *ś*, namely, G. *s*, Shb., Mans. *ś*. In support of combining the phenomena mentioned above, it may be recalled that the dialects of the Gīrnār, Shāhbāzgarhi, and Mansehra redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts otherwise share a number of points in common as opposed to the dialects of the other versions of these Edicts. For example the sounds *r*, *ṛ*, *ṛ*, *ṛ* (written *ṛ*) as the equivalent of Skt. *ṛ* in *kalyāṇa-*, *bh* as the correspondent to Skt. *bh* in *bhāvati*, *cch* (written *ch*) as the counterpart of Skt. *ḥ*, the retention of Indic *st*, the adverb *evam* (Kālsī, etc., *hevam*), the pronoun *aham* (Kālsī, Dhauri, Jaugada *hakan*), *ayam* used as nom. sing. fem. (K., etc., *iyam*), etc.

² Except in the combination *ṣi* as Franke correctly saw. In this case the *ś* is assimilated to the preceding *ś*. See footnote 2, p. 289.

Cases like *Priyadrasīsa*¹ do not fall under (4) as they owe the -*sa* to the -*sa* of *a*-stems. *Saśayike* of Mans. is purely a blunder for *saś-*, cf. Shb. *sa[ṁ]śayike*. Shb. *pa[ṁca]ṣu*, Mans. *paṁ[ca]ṣu* and -*caṣu* owe the -*ṣu* to *a*-stems as Johansson rightly saw. Similarly Shb. and Mans. *ṣaṣu*. Shb. *daśavaṣabhisito*, Mans. *daśavaṣabhisite*, etc., have -*s-* for -*ṣ-* by the analogy of the simplex, as Johansson previously saw.

There remains, however, a small number of cases in which a dental sibilant takes the place of an Indic lingual or palatal one. These have thus far remained unexplained except by the assumption that the three symbols for *s*, *ś*, *ṣ* all really represent one sound, namely, *s*. Yet a simple solution is readily to be found: they are due to the influence of the 'Māgadhan' original. This is certainly correct as all three Indic sibilants become dental *s* in the dialects of the Jaugada and Dhauli redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts and the six recensions of the Pillar-Edicts. (As I said above, p. 284, the dialect of the Kālsī version of the Fourteen-Edicts is essentially 'Māgadhan' in edicts i-ix. So in the matter of the sibilants, with a few exceptions, in these edicts the dialect of K. agrees with the dialects of J. and Dh. Later I will treat the history of the Indic sibilants in edicts x-xiv in a special paper.)

We will first take up the cases in which we find *s* for *ṣ*. These are:

a[rabḥ]i[yisu], Shb. i. 2, *a[ra]. su*, Mans. i. 4 (Kālsī *ālabhiyisu*. J. (*ā*)*labh(i)yisu*, Dh. [*ā*](*la*)*bhiyis(u)*;

¹ According to Johansson (Shb. i, § 20) *etisa* is for Indic **etḥsya*, the intermediate stages being **ētasya*, **ētḥsya*, whence *ētissa* (the *s* of *etisa* is merely graphical). This is not in the least probable as in that case there would be no reason why we should not have such forms as **athrisa* as gen. singulars in Shb. and Mans., cf. Sanskrit *drthasya*. And in point of fact such forms are unknown to these texts, even if found elsewhere. Moreover, granting that the dialects of the Shb. and Mans. texts had stress-accent (and I think that this may safely be assumed), it does not necessarily follow that a system of initial accentuation was in vogue. We should rather suppose the system be that of Classical Sanskrit. According to this system the penult of *etissa* (written *etisa*) would be accented as the *i* is long by position. The same applies to Shb. *imisa*. One thing certain is that no matter what the origin of the *i* in the words under discussion is, the -*sa*, i. e. -*ssa* stands for -*śja* (Skt. -*śya*), cf. *Priyadrasīsa*. Personally, from the evidence afforded by Pāli and Prākṛit, I am inclined to believe that the *i* of *etisa* and *imisa* is due to the analogy of the corresponding feminine genitives. But to go into the matter further would require more space than is proper to a footnote.

anu[lo]cayisu, Mans. iv. 18—a well-known blunder for **alocayisu*, Dh. *alocayis(u)*, J. *alocayi-*; per contra note *loce[ṣ]u*, Shb. iv. 10);

husu, Mans. viii. 34 (Kalsī and Delhi-Sivalik *husu*; per contra observe Shb. *abhavasu*);

yesu, Shb. xiii. 4 (edicts xi-xiii are lacking in J. and Dh., and so we lack a direct check: but as the loc. pl. of *a*-stems ends in *-esu* otherwise in them as well as in K. in edicts i-ix, it is certain that *yesu* is a 'Māgadhism', for the loc. pl. of *a*-stems otherwise invariably ends in *-eṣu* in the Mansehra as well as Shāhbāzgarhi redaction).

We have next to consider the cases in which 'Māgadhan' *s* appears for native *ś*. The simplest example of this are *sama-cariyaṃ* and *anusocan[am]* at Shb. xiii. 8 and 2 respectively. In [*s*]ramarati, Shb. xiii. 12, [*s*]rama[rati], Mans. xiii. 13 (Sanskrit *śrama-*) we have a blend of native **śrama-* and 'Māgadhan' **sama-*, precisely as Shb., Mans. *dhrama-* is a blend of native *dhrama-* and 'Māgadhan' *dhamma-*. This last has long been recognized. In IF. xxiii, p. 240 I have shown that Shb. *praṭi* is a blend of the same type, and below, p. 295, that Shb. *aṭhra-* is also. So we have abundant parallels to support the present contention. Examples where Indic (and native) *śr-* remains are Shb., Mans. *śramaṇa-*, Shb. *śruṇeyu*, Mans. *śruṇey[u]*, Shb., Mans. *śravakaṃ*. . . . The correspondents to Sanskrit *śreṣṭha-* offer some difficulties. We should expect **śresta-* and this only as the phonetic equivalent in the dialects of Shb. and Mans. In point of fact, however, this never occurs: we have Shb. *sreṣṭha-* Shb., Mans. *sreṣṭha-*, i. e. *sresta-mati* at Shb. i. 2, [*sr*]eṭh[am] at Shb. iv. 10, *sre[ṭh]e* at Mans. iv. 17. The *ṭh* of the last two is an undoubted 'Māgadhism' (see Johansson, Shb. ii, p. 17) as is also the final *e* of *sre[ṭh]e* (cf. K. *seṭhe*, Dh. *se[ṭhe]*). It is natural therefore to suspect that in all three cases the initial *sr-* is a blend of native *śr-* and 'Māgadhan' *s-*. The fact that *seṭe* of the Gīrnār text has 'Māgadhan' initial *s-* for native *sr-* as well as 'Māgadhan' final *-e* for native *-am* makes for the same belief.

There is one case where we find 'Māgadhan' *ss* (written *s*) for native *śś* (which of course would be written *ś*) in place of Indic *-ṣṭi-*, namely, *anuvidhi[yisaṃti]*, Mans. xiii. 11 (Kalsī *anuvidhiyisaṃti*; per contra note Shb. *anuvidhiyisaṃti*).

Badaya- '12' of the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction is certainly an error for **badaśa-*: see Johansson, Shb. i, p. 142 (28 of the

reprint), and Buehler, *Epigraphia Indica* ii, p. 450, footnote 44, p. 452, footnote 75.¹ Per contra note Shb. *daśa-*, etc. (see Johansson, Shb. ii, pp. 76, 77).

With these restrictions the sibilants of the Shāhbāzgarhi and Mansehra recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts correspond to the respective Indic sibilants. I know of no exception.²

2. THE HISTORY OF INDIC *rth*.

The history of Indic *rth* in the dialect of the Mansehra redaction is unquestionable; it remains *rth*, naturally written *thr*. For in Buehler's text in EI. we have corresponding to Sanskrit *artha-*, *athra-*, written plainly 17 times; and *nirathriya* occurs once, exactly as if **nirarthya-* occurred in Sanskrit as *anarthya-* does. There are some additional cases of *athra-*, but in these certain letters are either not clear or are missing. That is to say *athra-*, and *atkra-* only, is the correspondent to Sanskrit *artha-*. There are no other test-cases to show the history of Indic *rth* than those cited; we must therefore inevitably come to the conclusion stated at the beginning of this paragraph.

Now since the language of the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction is agreed to be essentially the same as that of the Mansehra version, we should naturally expect to find the correspondent to Indic *rth* in this text *thr*, and *thr* only. Yet in point of fact this occurs but once, namely in *athrasa* at iv. 10. The regular correspondent to Sanskrit *artha-* is *aṭha-* (i. e. *aṭṭha-*). This occurs 16 times clearly according to the text in EI. But it should be observed that *aṭha-* (i. e. *aṭṭha-*) is the regular correspondent to Skt. *artha-* in the Dhāuli and Jaugāḍa recensions of the Fourteen-Edicts and in the six redactions of the Pillar-Edicts, no other correspondent occurring in any of these. It therefore follows from the premises laid down in the Introduction that *aṭha-* of the

¹ Apparently Franke thinks that *badaya-* is not an error. As there is no other case in which *y* takes the place of *ś* in the dialect of Shb., or for that matter in any other dialect as far as I know, I confess that I am puzzled at his rejection of the current view, even if *badaya-* is found twice.

² All other deviations in the lists of Senart and Johansson disappear in the editions of the text by Buehler in *Epigraphia Indica*, vol. ii. If Franke had not previously made his announcement (*vide supra*), I should have felt it incumbent upon me to give complete collections to prove this. As it is, I think it hardly necessary. [*Priyadrasi* at Shb. viii. 17 is a misprint: see ZDMG. xliii, p. 151].

Shāhbāzgarhi text is a 'Māgadhism', and that *athrasa* represents the true native form, thus agreeing with the dialect of the Mansehra recension. As a parallel where 'Māgadhisms' are found in Shb. but not in Mans., I need only recall the correspondents to Sanskrit *sarva-* which are *savra-* and *sava-* in the former, but *savra-*, and this only, in Mans. Now admitting that *aṭha-* in the Shāhbāzgarhi recension is a 'Māgadhism' we are forced to consider *aṭhra* at vi. 14 to be a blend of native *athra(m)*¹ and 'Māgadhan' *aṭham*. Similarly *nirathriyam* at ix. 18 is a blend of *nirathriyam* and 'Māgadhan' *nilaṭhiyam*, cf. Dhauri (*nilaṭhiya*)*m*. If *supathraye* at i. 2 be the true reading, it is to be judged in a like manner. The principle of these blends has been recognized before now: the novelty is only in applying it to these cases.

I may add that *anatheṣu* at Mans. v. 23, Shb. v. 12 is unrelated to Sanskrit *anārtha-*, though connection with this is commonly assumed: it corresponds to Sanskrit *anātha-* as is demonstrated by the Dhauri correspondent *anāthesu* (observe the long *-ā-* and the dental *th*); the Kālsī text, it is true, has *anāthesu* in the corresponding passage, but this is only a blunder as are *mātāpitisu*, iii. 8, *dhammānusathīye*, iv. 10, *dhammānusathī*, viii. 23, *lājā*, x. 28, *lājinā*, xiv. 19, *vimānadasanā*, iv. 9, *pāṣaṇḍāni*, xii. 31, and *mādhuliyāye*, xiv. 22.

Unless I am mistaken, *athakramam* at Shb. vi. 14 is a misprint for *aṭha-*: see ZDMG. xliii, p. 147. But [*a*] *tham* at ix. 20 is not. The simplest explanation, and therefore the most satisfactory one, is that it is an error for *aṭham*, induced by [*a*] *tha* (Sanskrit *atha*) in the preceding sentence as conversely we have *aṭham* for *atha* in the corresponding sentence of the Kālsī text by the influence of *aṭham* (Skt. *artham*) in the next sentence. In this case we are but linguistically concerned with the [*a*] *tham* of the Shb. text.

I have given my exposition first without criticising the views of others, as I think that it will stand on its own merits. Now I shall take up the previous theories, and try to show that they are untenable.

Johansson in his work on the dialect of the Shāhbāzgarhi redaction, i, pp. 165, 167, 168, 187, 188 (51, 53, 54, 73, 74 respectively of the reprint) and ii, p. 25 treats the problem, and comes

¹ Final *m* is often omitted.

to very different conclusions than those given above. The last reference seems to embody his final views which are that Indic *rth* became *r̥h* (with lingual *h*) in the dialect of Shb., but that the *r* was probably not completely sounded, and therefore liable to be omitted graphically; yet he held that the *r* was not wholly lost as shown by the fact that *r̥h* was often written *thr*. I first remarked that even in the text of Shb. which Johansson had before him, *thr* occurs but twice: this is not often. It is true that at i, p. 165 (51 of the reprint) he says that *athrasa* at iv. 10 is for *ḁthrasa* with lingual *h*; this then would make three instances; but I submit that this assumption is wrong as we have *athrasa* in the corresponding passage of Mans.; now if *rth* became *r̥h* in the dialect of Mans. we would certainly find *ḁthra-* written at least once; and this is not the case; *athra-* (with dental *h*), and this only, is the correspondent to Sanskrit *artha-* in this version. Johansson seems to have overlooked this fact, and so to have completely ignored this piece of evidence. And he is certainly in error when he attributes *atham* to the influence of the 'Māgadhan' original, admitting that he does so by implication only; for as stated above, *ḁtha-*, and this only is the correspondent to Sanskrit *artha-* in the Dhāuli and Jaugada redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts and the six recensions of the Pillar-Edicts; hence *ḁtha-* (i. e. *ḁ̐tha-*) was certainly the form native to the 'Māgadhan' dialect: see the Introduction. . . . On page 167 (53 of the reprint) of part i. Johansson suggests that *ḁthra-* and *athra-* (i. e. *ar̥tha-* and *artha-* respectively) should be compared with Pāli *a̐̐tha-*, and *atha-* (i. e. *attha-*) with Pāli *attha-*. As I have shown that *thr* and *thr* are not the same, the first comparison falls to the ground; and as *atham* is found but once, and then readily explicable as a simple error, the second one also fails. At the bottom of the page he queries whether such doublets as Pāli *a̐̐tha-* and *attha-* were originally dialectic doublets, and then later mixed, or whether both forms arose in the same dialect by the operation of certain phonetic laws. On the next page he suggests that the nature of the accent, acute or circumflex, may have had a modifying influence, and so caused the doublets. To this query I reply that in the Gīrnār redaction of the Fourteen-Edicts we have *attha-* (of course written *atha-*), and this only, as the correspondent to Sanskrit *artha-*, precisely as we have *a̐̐tha-* (written *ḁtha-*) in the Dhāuli and Jaugada redactions of the Fourteen-Edicts and the six recensions of the

Pillar-Edicts, and no other correspondent: it therefore would seem highly probable—nay certain—that Pāli *aṭṭha-* and *attha-* are due to dialect-mixture.¹ It is true that in the Kālsī recension of the Fourteen-Edicts we also have the doublets *aṭṭha-* and *attha-* (written of course *aṭha-* and *attha-* respectively); but this is to be interpreted that the form proper to the native dialect is *attha-*, and *aṭṭha-* a 'Magadhism'; for the principle involved, see Franke, *Pāli und Sanskrit*, p. 109. Incidentally I remark that we know nearly nothing concerning the accentual system, or systems, of most of the dialects of the inscriptions of Asoka. We do know, however, that the accentual system of the dialects of the Radhia, Mathia, and Rāmpurvā redactions of the Pillar-Edicts was identical with, or closely resembled, that of Classical Sanskrit. At any rate the accent was stressed, and the ultima was unaccented. For final *-ā*—whether originally final, or final by the loss of a final consonant—is regularly shortened in these dialects except in the case of accented monosyllables, and before enclitics and postpositives. The proof of this law I have given in my 'Notes on the Pillar-Edicts of Asoka', IF. xxiii, pp. 219–271. I may add that the same law apparently holds good in the dialects of the Rummindei and Niglīva Pillar inscriptions; but the evidence is rather meagre.

TRUMAN MICHELSON.

THE HARVARD CLUB, NEW YORK CITY.

¹See also Windisch, *Transactions Internat. Cong. Orient.*, 14¹, Première Section, pp. 279–280.

III.—NOTES ON LATIN SYNTAX.

The following notes owe their origin to a book, rich not only in valuable information regarding *proprietas splendorque verborum*, but in problems of interest to the student of syntax, the Schmalz-Krebs' *Antibarbarus*.¹ In a book of so vast a scope and so full of suggestiveness, containing the results of the most recent investigations, enriched by the fruits of the extended labors of one long recognized as *peritissimus linguae Latinae*, many statements would naturally arouse discussion. I limit myself, however, to the following.

Ac before Gutturals: the fact that three writers, Varro, Livy, and Plin. Mai., are conspicuous for the frequency with which they use *ac* in this position is to be emphasized.² The style of Plin. Mai. is also conspicuous for the number of times he uses *atque non*, 27 in all,³ a fact all the more remarkable when it is taken into consideration that he uses the regular *ac non* only 4 times (2, 162; 7, 7; 18, 245; 31, 97). According to both Schmalz Synt.³, § 224 and the Thesaurus, Col. 1075, '*atque non* is only found in Plin. Nat'. Note, however, its use in Plaut. Trin. 104 (G. and Sch., and Lindsay), Varro, L. L. 6, 38 (Spengel), Gell. 17, 21, 46 (Hosius) and Auson., Ad Grat. Ep., l. 8 (P., p. 353). Cf. *neque non* Livy 24, 2, 4; Gell. 13, 11, 6; 17, 10, 17. Theoretically such forms ought not to occur at all.⁴

¹ The Seventh Edition (1905-8), Vol. I, pp. viii-811, Vol. II, 776, shows an increase of 136 pages, 131 new articles: "*Redditus auctori debitus honor*",—"Applause, in spite of trivial faults, is due". For the writer's reviews of Vol. I, see Class. Rev. 20 (1906) pp. 218-222, and A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), pp. 34-55.

² *Ac* before *c*: in Varro (L. L., R. R.) 43, Livy 48, Plin. Mai. 37. The Thesaurus omits under *c*: Ovid. Met. 15, 398, Sen. N. Q. 1, pr. 11 (G.); Mela 1, 2, Quint. 10, 1, 47, Apul. Met., pp. 22, 13; 218, 29; 278, 7; 282, 18 (Helm); under *g*: Lucr. 6, 440, Celsus, p. 126, 4 (D.), Plin. Mai. 2, 135, 18, 81, Sen. Ep. 88, 9, Just. 7, 3, 4, Suet. Cal. 17, 2, Oros. 1, pr. 16; under *q*: Plin. Mai. 2, 200; 206; 10, 157; 18, 95; 33, 29, Val. Fl. 7, 267.

³ *Atque non*: the Thesaurus omits for Pliny: 2, 92; 12, 97; 17, 91; 20, 57; 32, 60; 36, 198; 37, 42; 115, cites 7, 7 = *ac non* (M.), and does not note the contrasted use of *ac non*.

⁴ Cf. Niedermann-Hermann, Hist. Laut. des. Lat. (1907), § 32.

From the point of view of the history of *ac* as contrasted with *atque*, it is important to note that there is a regular increase in the use of the shorter form from 28.4 % in Sallust to 74.3 % in Suetonius.¹

Cum praesertim: a collocation non-existent, according to some writers. See, however, *Antib.*¹. II, p. 364 and Nägelsbach-M., *Stil.*⁹, p. 742, and add to their lists: Sall. Cat. 51, 19; Cic. S. Rosc. 66, Inv. 1, 5, Brut. 3, Or. 32, Off. 2, 56, Fam. 2, 6, 2; 3, 5, 3; 10, 10; 5, 20, 4; Att. 8, 11 (D.), 3; 14, 1; 10, 10, 2; 13, 2; 11, 11, 1; 12, 25, 1; Livy 32, 20, 6; Val. Max. 2, 10, 6; 6, 1, 4; Celsus, pp. 76, 29; 317, 15 (D.), Quint. 2, 21, 13; 7, 1, 62; 8, 6, 74; 10, 1, 105, Apul. Met. 7, 9 (p. 161, 4 Helm).

Diffidens with the ablative: according to the *Antib.*¹, 'found in Silver Latin only in Suet. Caes. 3'; note, however, its use in Front. Str. 1, 8, 5 (G.) *paucitate suorum diffidens*.

Dignus with the infinitive: to Draeger II², p. 332 and the *Antib.*¹. add: Sen. N. Q. 6, 30, 5; Ep. 89, 5, Mela 1, 1; 75, Gell. 15, 18, 1, and to the 7 passages cited for Ovid by Kübler (*Progr.* K. W. Gymn. Berl., 1861, p. 8) add: Her. 17, 102; Met. 10, 336; 14, 833; Trist. 2, 242; 3, 4, 34; Fast. 1, 1, 226; 3, 490. See further A. J. P. XXVIII, p. 41 f. and add, with *ut*: Quint. Decl. 263 (p. 76, 26, R.), Script. Hist. Aug. 23, 21, 2. According to Schmalz, *Synt.*³, § 86 and *Antib.*¹, *dignus* with the dative is not found until Late Latin. Cf., however, Stat. Silv. 4, 6, 59.

Excedere, with *modum*: Val. Max. 4, 3, 5, Sen. Ep. 45, 13, Plin. Min. 2, 4, 4; 5, 13; 3, 11, 8; 7, 33, 10; 8, 24, 10; with *tempus* Val. Max. 5, 4, 3, *circuitum* Mela 2, 97, *alvum* Plin. Min. 8, 7, 1, *annum* 2, 3, 5, *crimina* 2, 11, 2, *licentiam* 3, 20, 3, *numerus* Trai. Ep. 95, *naturam* Macr. 1, 23, 1, *fidem* Sen. Ep. 97, 3.

Igitur first in the sentence: its marked frequency in Celsus, Justin, and Orosius, is a striking feature of the style of each (in Celsus 34 times, postponed 3, in Apul. (Met., Apol.), 23 times, postponed 5, in Oros. 70, postponed 12).³

Itaque: its use in the following writers is striking: Celsus, following the Class. usage places it first 20 times, postpones it 6,

¹ Cf. Lease, *Class. Phil.* 3 (1908), p. 304.

³ Neue-W. *Formenlehre* II³, p. 975 shows a very faulty treatment of this word: in e. g., Val. Max. 16 passages are omitted, in Plin. Min. 19, in Justin 74, in Curtius 49, in Suet. 5, and in Orosius 70. See further, Lease A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 48.

and Orosius, first 42 times, postponed 15, but in Apul. Met. (Helm) it is placed first only once (p. 10, 12), and postponed 20 times. See further Lease, A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 48.¹

Loci: according to the Antib.⁷ *interea loci* is found only in Plaut. and Ter., but cf. Pacuv. Chrys. 1 (R. 1897). Lorenz to Pseud. 255 is a better reference than Reisig-H. Anm. 530.

Longe with a Comparative: an important treatment is found in Wölfflin, Comp. p. 41, though the lists there given might well be extended.² For Plautus cf. Lorenz to Most. 911.

Merere ut: the Antib.⁷ says this usage is found only once in Livy, 28, 19, 6, but it is also found in two other passages, 7, 21, 6 and 40, 11, 6. It is also found more than once in Cicero; cf. Fin. 2, 74; Verr. 4, 135. *Merere* with infin.: to Draeger II², p. 331 add Eutrop. 9, 15, 2; 10, 8, 2.

Metuere with dative: note its use of things in Livy 3, 49, 5 (*vitae*), 23, 16, 3 (*castris*) and of persons in 1, 9, 6 (*sibi*). Note also: *huic puero metuit*, Cic. Sulla 88. For its use with the infin., cf. Draeger II², p. 342 and add Ovid, Met. 1, 745.

Miscere: to this word the Antib.⁷ devotes but four lines and does not note its use with the dative or with *cum*.³ To the

¹ Neue II², p. 976, cites Liv. 22, 24 8 (= utique), Curt. 7, 10, 7 (wrong reference) and omits: Plin. Mai. 2, 129; 193; 5, 98; 8, 176; 11, 64, Mart. 8 pr., Suet. Tib. 11, 3, Cae. 37, 3; 48, 1, Claud. 11, 1, Vit. 5, Prat. 147 (R.), Front. Str. 1, 1, 1; 6; 2, 9, 10; 3, 1, 1.

² Add to a) with *regular comp.*, Livy 39, 31, 7, Sen. Suas. 2, 14, Contr. 2, 6, 12, Val. Max. 1, 7 ext. 3, Celsus, p. 77, 11 (D.), Sen. N. Q. 1, 5, 2; 6, 6; 2, 32, 1; 5, 5, 1; Quint. 6, 3, 13; 4, 21; 10, 1, 67 (bis), Plin. Min. 1, 14, 10; 8, 24, 6; 10, 39, 4, Apul. Met., p. 216, 14 (Helm), Gell. 13, 29, 3; 17, 21, 9, Veget., p. 35, 8; 108, 20 (L.), Macr. 3, 5, 9, Oros. 3, 13, 11, and to b) with *irreg. comp.* Livy 24, 28, 5; 37, 52, 10; 40, 6, 7, Val. Max. 5, 2, 7; 6, 3, 9; 8, 1 Absol. 12, Sen. Contr. 7, 1, 25; 2, 27, Sen. N. Q. 1, 6, 5; 16, 2, Plin. Mai. 24, 109, Plin. Min. 2, 3, 10; 8, 14, 24; 18, 1, Just. 3, 7, 6; 6, 2, 14; 9, 3, 9, Front. Str. 2, 3, 12; 5, 9, Apul. Met., p. 228, 14 (Helm), Gell. 13, 20, 3, Veget., p. 108, 10; 130, 17; 153, 14 (L.) and Oros. 7, 35, 2.

³ Livy's usage is as follows:

I MISCERE.

A. *Things*, 1) Simple ablative: here the form shows 10 uses (1, 29, 2; 8, 36, 5; 9, 38, 6, and with *mixtus* 2, 33, 8; 10, 16, 3; 21, 56, 6; 22, 1, 10; 26, 11, 2; 39, 42, 5; 40, 8, 3). With these are to be reckoned, also with *mixtus*, *fumo* 4, 33, 8, *vento* 21, 58, 3 (cf. *grandine* 26, 11, 2 and Lucr. 6, 159, Ovid Fast. 4, 625, Verg. Aen. 12, 838, Val. Max. 1, 6, 5 and *Vapore* Lucr. 2, 223), and, after the analogy of *metu* 39, 42, 5 (cf. Ovid Tr. 4, 3, 12) also *gaudio* 39, 21, 1. Here, too, probably belong *falsa mixta veris* 24, 30, 3 and *aequa iniquis miscet* 35, 17, 2. Cf. *mixta cum veris* Ovid, Met. 12, 54.

"literature" cited by Schmalz add: cf. Bennett, Trans. Am. Phil. Assn. 36 (1905), p. 71 f.

Multum with a *Comparative* (cf. πολλὸν μείζον); to Schmalz Synt³, § 88 add: Sil. Ital. 13, 708, Stat. Theb. 9, 559, Quint. 10, 1, 94, Juv. 10, 197; 12, 66. Cf. *aliquantum tætriore* Val. Max. 5, 9, 3. Cf. also Weiss.-M. to Livy³ 40, 40, 1.

2) Abl. with *cum*: 9, 22, 10 *cum dolore* (contrast *metu* 39, 42, 5 and *dolori* Sen. Ep. 99, 27), *cum insectatione* 40, 12, 6 *cum rebus Romanis* 45, 14, 3 (note *cum elocutione* Quint. 6, 5, 11, and contrast *cum verbis* Ovid Her. 10, 38 with *verbis* Id. A. A. 1, 663; note also *cum bonis tuis* Sall. Hist. 4, 69, 2 (M.), *cum meis lacrimis* Ovid, Pont. 1, 9, 20, and the frequent use of *cum* with things in Celsus). In Livy 1, 9, 4 *cum hominibus* is found, by brachylogy, = *cum sanguine hominum* (cf. Ovid Met. 12, 256 *cum sanguine*).

3) Dative belongs chiefly to poetry and post-classical prose (as shown by the form, e. g., in Val. Max. 2, 3, 2, Sen. Ep. 104, 12, Plin. Mai. 5, 75; 17, 119; 33, 132; 34, 168; with *misceri* Sen. Ben. 6, 6, 1, Ep. 7, 2; 97, 27, Plin. Mai. 2, 222; 18, 206; 19, 156; 24, 3; 72; with *mixtus* Sen. Ep. 66, 17, Plin. Mai. 22, 101; 24, 4; 43; 186; 29, 122; 30, 75; 36, 133). Livy shows but one possible example, 5, 37, 7 *Tiberino amni miscetur* (cf. *mixtum flumini* Curt. 9, 97).

B. *Persons*: here the form shows but one example, 24, 31, 3 *miscendi eos agmini*. Parallel to this is *hostibus* 4, 34, 1 (cf. *μίσγεται ἀνδρεσσιν*), *legionibus* 10, 31, 12 and here is to be enrolled also, *Romanis* 23, 4, 7, *patribus* 27, 51, 5, *feminis* 39, 8, 6, *nobis* 39, 37, 7, and *vobis* 4, 5, 5.

II COMPOUNDS OF MISCERE.

Admiscere: only 6, 40, 12 *vitali* (cibo), probably a dative (the form shows a dative in Sen. Ep. 66, 16, with *admixtus* in Plin. Mai. 27, 97; 28, 75; 29, 51; 36, 133).

Immiscere: according to the form, only six in the dative: *turbæ* 3, 50, 10; 8, 24, 15; 22, 60, 2; 23, 23, 7, *turmae* 10, 28, 7, *equiti* 26, 4, 10; but to this category probably also belong 5, 8, 6; 9, 36, 4; 39, 31, 8. With the passive, however, the dative is used 14 times, 7 being with *immixtus* (to the Antib¹ add: 21, 32, 7; 24, 3, 12; 27, 18, 12; 29, 28, 3; 30, 33, 12; 37, 39, 9; 40, 12, and for Plin. Nat.: 17, 25; 19, 155).

Two passages deserve particular attention on account of textual or syntactical difficulties. In 29, 28, 3 the text, without variants, is *hominum turba, mulierum puerorumque agminibus immixta*, in 30, 33, 12 the text according to M. Müller, reads *inter immixtos alienigenas*, and the variants are *mixtos alienigenis*. *Agminibus* is better regarded as a dative, and the text of M. M. is to be explained by supplying *popularibus* with *immixtos*. It should be noted that *agmini* is used in 10, 20, 12 with *intermixti*, in 24, 31, 3 with *miscendi eos*, and in Curt. 8, 12, 7 with *immixti*, and to explain *agminibus* as an ablative, as Fügner and Luterbacher do, is to disregard the meaning (personal) of this word and at the same time the force of the prefix *in*. The same line of reasoning is to be applied to 30, 33, 12, if *alienigenis* is the correct reading (so Zingerle and others).

Namque before *Consonants*: this usage is found as early as Liv. Andr. frg. 22 (B.). To Neue II³, p. 977 and Antib¹. add: Sall. Cat. 36, 5, Cic. Tusc. 3, 44; 65, N. D. 2, 109, Phil. 13, 45, and poet. frg., p. 308 (B.). For the use of *namque* in parenthesis Draeger II², p. 163 cites only one passage in Livy (3, 44, 6), but 9 are to be found in this writer. Cf. Lease, Livy, Intr., p. 39 for Livy's use of parenthesis. To Schmalz Synt³, p. 223 add: Nepos Alc. 1, 2, Eum. 4, 4. From a psychological and stylistic point of view it is interesting to note that some writers, as Cato Agr., Varro R. R., Celsus, Plin. Min., do not use *namque* at all, in others it is not at all common, Cicero (Rhet., Or., Phil.) using it only 35 times, Caesar only 10, and in still others it is a word of frequent occurrence, Nepos using it 64 times, Val. Max. 66, Quint. 65, and Tacitus 51. According to the Antib¹. (= 6th Ed.!) Tacitus uses *namque* only 3 times in second place, and in the first only before a consonant. Cf. also Ann. 2, 43, 22. In the first place he uses it 50 times, and of these only 18 precede a consonant! Furthermore, 'the first example of its post-position in Prose' is not in Varro L. L., but in Cinc. Alimentus (Funaioli, Gram. Rom. Frg. I, p. 2).

Nec = ne . . quidem: to Schmalz Stil³, p. 40 and Draeger II², p. 73 add: Lucr. 1, 1115; 5, 314; 6, 1214, Livy 3, 52, 9; 6, 15, 7, Luc. Phars. 8, 497, Quint. 9, 2, 67, Juv. 13, 97, and particularly Martial in whom this usage is found at least 20 times (1, 109, 20; 113, 2; 3, 2, 12; 4, 44, 8; 6, 3, 4, etc., and *sed nec* 2, 28, 3; 4, 82, 5; 5, 44, 4; 9, 48, 10; 12, 97, 8).¹ *Nec non et*: the Antib¹. refers to Archiv 8, p. 181; for additional occurrences see Lease, Archiv 10, p. 390 and A. J. P. XXI (1901), p. 452. This formula was more widely used by Vergil than by Ovid, but these writers and all others are eclipsed by Plin. Mai. in fondness for

Intermiscere, found only in perf. part.: *agmini* 10, 20, 12, *hostibus* 10, 20, 8, *turmis* 42, 58, 6, and: *intermiscendo dignis* 4, 56, 3.

Permiscere, also only in perf. part.: *senatui* 21, 14, 1, *turbæ* 30, 18, 7, *manipulis* 8, 6, 16, *hostibus* 31, 24, 16, *fugientibus* 26, 44, 4 (Caes., B. G. 7, 62, 9 uses *cum f.*), *feminis* 39, 13, 10 and *ploratibus* 38, 22, 8, probably abl. (cf. 2, 33, 8 *mixtus ploratu*). In 27, 35, 10 *permixtae = finitimæ*. This verb is also used twice with *cum*, 32, 18, 8 *fugientibus* (contrast 26, 44, 4 above) and 30, 10, 15 *navibus*.

¹ To the "literature" cited in the Antib¹. add: Nägelsb.-Müller Stil³, p. 771, Kirk, Studies in Honor of B. L. Gildersleeve, p. 31 f. and Langen to Val. Flacc. 4, 200.

this connective, using it at least 36 times.¹ For *neque* (*nec*) *enim* in Silver Latin cf. Lease, *Class. Rev.* 16 (1902), p. 212 and add the following:

	Neque enim.	Nec enim.
Cicero Rhet	36	11
Cicero Epist.....	47	22
Seneca Epist.....	16	8
Pliny Epist.....	72	0
Livy.....	54	18

Necesse est ut: both Dahl, *Lat. Part. ut*, p. 249 and Schmalz *Anm.* 482 to Reisig-H. Vorles. cite Sen. Ep. 78, 16 (= 78, 17 Hense), but here the text has been emended. To the passages cited add: Sen. Suas. 6, 10, Sen. N. Q. 2, 142 (G.), Quint. 5, 10, 123 (R.), Veget. pp. 16, 14; 24, 18 (Lang), Macr. 1, 17, 3; 6, 8, 6, Somn. Scip. 2, 14, 6; 21, Lact. 1, 3, 16; 2, 11, 8; 3, 12, 7; 9, 11; 18, 2; 24, 8; 7, 15, 11, Ira D., 1, 15, 7; 16, 3, Ambros Off. 1, 87; 2, 41, Aug. C. D. 13, 18; 14, 26; 16, 1; 17, 26; 21, 3 (bis), Conf. 1, 11; 10, 16 (Kn.); Script. Hist. Aug. 18, 49, 1; 20, 25, 4; Servius to Aen. 4, 102; 6, 839. For *necesse habeo* in Quintilian cf. Bonnell, *Lex.* and add 7, 2, 16.

Nescire with infin.: add to Draeger II², p. 304, Plin. Min. 5, 11, 3 *nescit stare* and to the top of p. 372, where no passage is cited in prose for *nescius*, Livy 27, 7, 5; 43, 13, 1 (the *Antib.* under *nescire* cites Quint. 8, 4, 28, but this is a quotation from Cicero).

Neve and *Neu*: for a detailed discussion of these two forms in general and in Livy in particular, together with their syntactical usage in that writer, cf. Lease, *Class. Phil.* 3 (1908), pp. 302-315. Particular attention is called to the statement on p. 312 and to two passages of the correlative use of *ut neve . . . neve*, Cic. De Or. 3, 171 and 172 (omitted by Draeger II², p. 695), in the latter of which are found two *verbs*, a usage thought to be non-existent in Latin by Bennett, *Critique*, p. 29.

¹ The *Archiv* 8, p. 181 incorrectly cites 29, 22 and omits: 2, 63; 3, 144; 6, 79; 142; 7, 78; 8, 219; 12, 34; 72; 13, 72; 14, 121; 15, 39; 16, 15; 29; 135; 245; 17, 56; 133; 244; 266; 18, 365; 19, 63; 20, 87; 21, 61; 26, 147; 28, 251; 31, 79; 111; 32, 110; 33, 23; 36, 161; 165. Plin. Mai., therefore, uses this formula the unusually large number of 36 times. Add also Suet. Cal. 40, Vesp. 18, Macr. 1, 9, 2; 4, 6, 10; 6, 4, 23; 7, 2, 6, and Char., p. 135, 20 = G. R. Frag. I, p. 484 (Funaioli).

Nolo ut: according to the *Antib.*¹, 'probably only in Hygin. fab. 189, 9', but also found in Firm. Mat. De Err. Prof. Rel. 8, 3 (p. 24, 182).

Pacisci ut: this construction, as also with an infin., first appears in prose in Livy, according to Draeger II², p. 248 and 319. In Livy *pacisci ut* is used 17 times, *ne* twice (37, 32, 10; 38, 24, 4), infin. once (21, 41, 9), acc. and infin. once (34, 23, 7). *Pacisci ut* is also found 3 times in Val. Max., once in Mela, twice in Plin. Min., once in Justin, 3 times in Suet., twice in Gell.¹

Plenus: for Livy's usage reference is often made to Drak. note to 3, 25, 6 (e. g., by Draeger I², p. 559, Luterbacher to Livy 5, 21, 10; 7, 28, 7). Here, however, Drak. cites only passages from the 1st decade. Accordingly, reference should also be made to his note at 27, 40, 8 (23, 12, 14; 27, 40, 8; 35, 32, 12 are omitted). In Livy, therefore, *plenus* is used with the genitive about 50 times, with the ablative only 9. Note also the use of the abl. in Ovid Am. 2, 6, 13, Rem. Am. 180, Front. Str. 4, 7, 9; 10, Oros. 7, 13, 2. Cf. further Lease, A. J. P. XXI (1904), p. 450.

Pluere: with this verb Livy prefers the abl. (used 29 times to the acc. (only 4); cf. Lease to Livy 21, 1. 1902, and H. J. Müller to 24, 10, 7 (*Anh.*², p. 100). Of a shower of stones Livy uses *lapides pluere* 15 times, *lapidari* 3 times (29, 10, 4; 14, 4; 44, 18, 6), *lapides cadere* in 1, 31, 2; 22, 1, 9; 41, 9, 4, besides *imbri lapidavit* 43, 13, 4 and *pluit lapideo imbri* 30, 38, 8.

Postquam: according to the *Antib.*¹. "Cicero bevorzugt offenbar *posteaquam*, wie ein Blick in das Lexicon von Merguet zeigt". "Das Lexicon" implies that there is only one. While that to the *speeches* does show such a preference, *posteaquam* being used 94 times, *postquam* only 19; the Lex. Phil. shows the contrary, *postquam* being used 9 times, the other not at all. In his rhetorical works, also, there is no decided preference, *posteaquam* being used 6 times, *postquam* 5. As a matter of fact, Cicero in his Speeches and Letters² greatly prefers *posteaquam*, but not in his Rhet. and Phil. works. In Caesar (Meusel Lex.) *posteaquam* is used 13 times, *postquam* 10. Sallust (Cat., Jug.), Nepos, and

¹ Add to Draeger II², p. 248, Livy 8, 36, 11; 9, 42, 7; 10, 37, 5; 46, 11; 22, 52, 3; 23, 15, 3; 24, 47, 8; 31, 17, 3; 45, 6; 32, 25, 9; 36, 9; 35, 51, 8; 38, 9, 9. Val. Max. 5, 4 ext. 3; 6, 1, 10; 7, 4, ext. 1, Mela 1, 38, Plin. Min. 6, 23, 2; Pan. 67, 7 (without *ut* 3, 12, 1), Just. 16, 4, 7, Suet. Caes. 9, 3; 19, 1; 29 (Ihm), Gell. 6, 18, 2. Cf. also Quint. Decl., pp. 321, 28; 356, 7 (R.).

² Cf. R. B. Steele, A. J. P. XXVIII (1907), p. 435 f.

Livy, however, all show a marked preference for *postquam* (65-1, 27-9, 372-3). Val. Max. and Plin. Min., it may be noted, use *postquam* frequently, but *posteaquam* not at all. In Cicero these forms are used with the perf. 106 times, the pres. 5, and in Livy with the perf. 258, the pres. 4 (6, 8, 10; 21, 13, 4; 23, 17, 4; 34, 19, 10), with the impf. 80, the plupf. 28.

Potiri: this verb is found with three cases in Plautus, with the abl. 3 times (Asin. 916, Curc. 173, Ps. 1071, and Arg. II 15), the acc. 3 times (Asin. 323, Most. 415, Rud. 190), the gen. 8 times (Am. 187, Asin. 555, Capt. 92, 144, 762, Ep. 532, 562, Rud. 1337). Note also the accus. in Caecil. St. 109 (R.), Lucr. 2, 659; 3, 1038; 4, 760.

Praeterquam: Livy's usage of this particle differs from that of Cicero: Cicero (Or. et Phil.) uses it only 10 times, but Livy uses it 96 times; in Cicero there is no preference for its use with *quod* (used 5 times), but in Livy it is so used 60 times out of 96. (Cf. Lease to Livy I, l. 1149).

Priusquam: here again Livy's usage differs from that of Cicero; Cicero prefers *antequam*, using it 213 times (Rhet. 15, Or. 83, Phil. 54, Ep. 61), to *priusquam*, used 112 times (Rhet. 7, Or. 45, Ph. 25, Ep. 35), but Livy prefers *priusquam* (as Sallust), using it 308 times, to *antequam*, 113 times. So also Nepos prefers *priusquam* (using it 25 times) to *antequam*, used not at all; Vel-leius, however, uses *antequam* 22 times and *priusquam* only twice (1, 10, 2; 2, 24, 23), and Tacitus, *antequam* 38 times, *priusquam* only 6. *Priusquam ut* is extremely rare, being found, as far as I know, only in Cic. Att. 4, 1, 1; 8, 11 (D.), 5, Lig. 34, Livy 26, 26, 7; 31, 11, 16; 35, 11, 5; 40, 47, 7 and Macr. 7, 8, 8.

Procul: according to the Antib¹. Livy often uses *procul a domo*; in the passage cited, however, as also in 23, 12, 3; 28, 12, 3; 37, 18, 2 and 40, 38, 2, *procul ab domo* is used. Livy is conspicuous in his fondness for *procul* as a preposition, using it in all 65 times (24-23-16-2),¹ but with *ab* only 40. *Procul dubio* is not "erst Suet. und Quint.", as Reisig Vorles. p. 735 stated, nor "erst Plin. Nat. 9, 184 und Liv. 39, 40, 10", as the Antib¹. maintains. Reisig had evidently overlooked Hand IV, p. 594, where Lucr. 1, 812 and Livy 39, 40, 10 are cited. As a matter of fact, the expression is found as early as Cato (cf. Gell. 3, 7, 6),

¹ Neue II³, p. 771 cites only 17 occurrences in Livy, and omits the usage of Val. Max. (7), Curtius (8), and 10 passages in Tacitus, 4 in Ovid.

Ennius (cf. Cic. Fam. 7, 6, 1), Accius (cf. Gell. 3, 11, 5), Hyginus (cf. Gell. 10, 16, 18), and later in Val. Max. 1, 5, 5; 3, 2, 9; 5, 2, 5; 7; 6, 2, 5; 9, 4 ext. 1; 9, 7 Mil. 1. It is not found "erst in Plin. Nat. 9, 184", but in 2, 165, later in 17, 86; cf. further Lease, A. J. P. XXI, p. 451.

Prohibere aliquem aliqua re: for Livy's usage the Antib¹ refers to "Fabri zu 22, 14, 2". To the list of 4 here given add: 1, 49, 1; 7, 4, 4; 25, 13; 27, 12, 10. For this verb with a passive infin. "M. Müller zu 2. 34, 11" is referred to; to his list of 17 add 6, 24, 9. Livy in 26, 40, 4 uses *quin* after *nec poterat*, in 25, 35, 6 he uses *quominus* after *non posset*. With *ne*: to Draeger II, p. 294 add Livy 24, 43, 4; 38, 56, 13.

Quamquam: while in Caesar and Nepos *etsi* is the favorite concessive particle, and in Sallust not used at all,¹ *quamquam* is the most common in Cicero's Speeches and Rhet. Works,² in Livy (124 times: 32-50-29-13) and Quintilian (124).³ *Quamquam* with Subjunctive: neither Draeger II², p. 768 nor Kühnast, p. 244 cite Livy 38, 9, 11; 57, 8 (cf. H. J. M. *ad loc.*, 3rd ed., 1907). Plin. Mai. 14, 24 and Suet. Caes. 70, Gram. 21 use *quamquam* with an abl. abs., and Plin. Mai. 19, 67; 28, 114; 29, 80; 36, 62 uses it with a pres. part. Cf. further A. J. P. XXI, p. 453.

Quamvis with impf. subj.: found in Cicero, as Brut. 174, Fam. 7, 32, 3, Att. 12, 23, 1, and Sall. Or. Macr. 20, the Aug. poets and late, as Aug. Conf. 4, 6; 6, 4; 10, 15 (Kn.), Oros. 6, 8, 9; 11, 24; 7, 3, 9; with plpf. sub., Verg. Ecl. 6, 50, Plin. Mai. 33, 135, Sen. Ep. 76, 26, and at least 9 times in Orosius; cf. further A. J. P. XXI, p. 453. For its use with the indic. cf. Draeger II², p. 770 and add: Val. Max. 2, 2, 7, Celsus 33, 6; 82, 9, etc., Sen. Brev. Vit. 6, 4, Lucan 3, 748, Petron. 58. With the superl., also found in Val. Max. 8, 15 pr., Suet. Dom. 14, 3; with abl. abs., in Ovid Rem. Am. 793, Plin. Mai. 11, 6; 17, 8, Lucan 5, 811, Suet. Caes. 48, and with the pres. part. in Plin. Mai. 11, 270.

Que: for *que . . . que* cf. Draeger II², p. 80. Here, however, Liv. 26, 57 is cited for 26, 51, and the following are omitted: Liv. 26, 33, 15, Sen. Clem. 1, 6, 5; 2, 1, 3, Macr. 5, 22, 10, Som. Scip. 1, 14, 6; 16, 9. Note Livy's addition of *que* to final *ē*

¹ Reisig-H. Vorles., p. 268, Anm. 427, b.

² Cic. Rhet. has *quamquam* 65 times, *etsi* 24 times.

³ Quintilian uses *quamquam* 124 times, *quamvis* 31, and *etsi* 8.

in *morteque* 8, 9, 7 and possibly in *tabeque* 21, 39, 2 (cf. Neue I³, p. 374). The use of *que* at the end of a period, avoided by Cic. and Caes., but found in Sall. Cat. 5, 1; 15, 1, Jug. 4, 9, is a characteristic feature in Livy's style (about 25 in the 3d decade alone), and was observed also in Plin. Mai. 33, 103, Sen. Ep. 66, 10, Plin. Min. (16 times), Front. Str. (6 times).

Quin, with a Command in *O. O.*: add to the two passages in Livy cited by the Antib¹. 38, 43, 8; 39, 32, 11; 40, 40, 4. *Quin*, consecutive, is used, much more frequently (94) than *quominus* (38).¹ *Non quin* was used twice by Livy, 2, 15, 2; 32, 32, 6.² *Quin*, interrogative, was used 20 times by Livy, 5 in *O. O.*, 14 with pres. indic. (8 in 1st dec.), one with fut. pf. (1, 45, 6); *quin*, corroborative, 28 times, alone 15 (10-3-2-0), + *etiam* 6 (only in 1st dec.), + *contra* 5 (6, 37, 8; 7, 5, 1; 31, 31, 9; 35, 26, 10; 37, 15, 3), + *potius* twice (22, 41, 4; 26, 19, 8), and with *et* not at all. *Quin et*, however, was preferred by Val. Max., decidedly so by Plin. Mai. and Tacitus, but used only once by Quint. (3, 8, 14). *Quin immo* was used 12 times by Plin. Mai. (14, 34; 15, 7, etc., and *quin immo etiam* in 37, 17; 197), by Quint. 6 times (cf. Bonnell, Lex.), and by Plin. Min. 5 (1, 8, 4; 2, 11, 11; 3, 16, 4; 7, 23, 1, Pan. 69, 5). Note *quin . . non* Cic. Att. 5, 11, 6; 8, 11, D. 3, Cels. 109, 17 (D.).

Quisquam, with things: according to the Antib¹. 'already in Lucr., cf. Holze, p. 111'. Two objections can be found to this statement, the first being that the reference should be to Holze I, p. 402, the second, that the usage is found earlier, in Plautus (Men. 447, Most. 608). To Draeger I², p. 99 add: Quint. 4, 1, 10; 10, 7, 3.

Quisque in plural: cf. Antib¹, but note that this usage is not found "Zuerst bei rhet. Her.", but in Plaut. Most. 155. To M. Müller, Livy I², p. 173, add for Masc. and Fem. plur. to the one cited, 10, 35, 8; 37, 43, 8, Masc., and 25, 22, 8; 26, 45, 2; 39, 31, 12 Fem.

Recusare with the infin.: according to the Antib¹. never found in Cicero, but there is at least one example, Ad Att. 1, 8, 1 (cited by Draeger II², p. 336¹). Add to Draeger, p. 336: Plin. Ep. 4, 17, 11; 9, 13, 2, on p. 692: *non recusare quominus* Val. Max. 8, 1 Abs. 10. In Livy *recusare* is followed by *quin* 5 times (to

¹ Draeger II², pp. 670 and 691 cites only 33 occurrences of *quin* and 24 of *quominus*.

² Omitted by Stegmann, N. Jahrb., 1887, p. 263.

Dr. II¹, p. 671 add 29, 18, 9; 30, 30, 25; 32, 21, 15; 42, 42, 3), by *quominus* 3 times (add to Id., p. 691: 43, 16, 12).

Refert: found in Quintilian 37 times,¹ *interest* 25 times, but in Pliny the Younger *interest* is used 21 times, *refert* 15 times. Note the use of *parvi refert* in Quint. 1, 4, 21 and add to Draeger I², p. 465. The remaining uses of the genitive in Quint. are 9, 44, 4 *compositionis*, and twice of persons (8, 6, 58; 12, 8, 2). In Pliny there are but two occurrences of the gen. with *refert*, 8, 22, 4 and Pan. 40, 5, both of things. With *interest* Quint. uses the gen. 3 times (of things 7, 2, 20; 10, 1, 11, of persons 3, 6, 2), Pliny 7 times (of things 9, 13, 25; 10, 98, 2, Pan. 21, 3; 60, 3, of persons 5, 21, 2; 6, 3, 2; Pan. 65, 2). The ablat. *mea*, etc., as in Cicero, is more common with *interest* than with *refert*: in these two authors, however, only *interest* is so used, in Quint. once (7, 4, 10) with *sua*, in Pliny 5 times (2, 1, 14; 5, 1, 13; 6, 6, 8; 7, 20, 6, Pan. 84, 4). Note that Pliny in 1, 23, 1 uses *plurimum refert*, a few lines below, *plurimum interest*, followed in each case by exactly the same words.

Studere: in Plautus this verb is used 23 times, 11 with the dative, twice with accus. (Mil. 1437, Truc. 337), 5 with the infin. (Am. 182, Asin. 281, Bacch. 1161, Poen. 818, Ps. 523), 3 with accus. and infin. (Am. 892, Asin. 67, Stich. 52), and twice with *ut* (Capt. Arg. 4, Poen. 575). It is to be noted that the Antib¹. cites Plaut. Asin. 167 for the use of the dative of the gerund. Plautus, however, uses only the gerundive construction with this verb, Merc. 192, Stich. 678 (in Asin. 67 the acc. and infin. is used).

Suadere with infin.: to the list in Draeger II², p. 324 add: Auct. Her. 3, 8, Quint. 2, 7, 2; 6, 3, 92; 11, 2, 49.

Subinde: according to the Antib¹., 'first in prose in Livy, then Suet.': cf., however, Val. Max. 5, 4 ext. 5, Celsus, p. 100, 5 (D.), Sen. N. Q. 6, 32, 12, Ben. 7, 21, 2, Prov. 4, 9, Ep. 13, 13, (in Ep., at least 20 times), Curt. 7, 7, 30; Col. 2, 4, 11; 6, 30, 2; 11, 2, 8, Mela 3, 47; 102, Plin. Mai. Pr. 28; 11, 81; 144; 34, 120, Quint. 6, 3, 85; 8, 3, 58; 9, 3, 27; 11, 1, 17; 2, 24; 135, Tac. Agr. 14, Plin. Min. 2, 76.

Temperare with a dative: Seyffert and Heräus, according to the Antib¹., each maintained that this construction appeared first in Livy. Drakenborch to Livy 28, 44, 18, however, already called

¹ Under *refert* Bonnell, Lex. omits 1, 10, 40; 3, 8, 48; 4, 2, 116; 7, 2, 14; 8, 6, 24; 9, 1, 17 (5, 12, 17 is cited for 5, 12, 7), under *interest*: 2, 10, 9; 4, 2, 79; 7, 2, 14 and 10, 5, 13.

attention to its appearance in Plautus Rud. 1254. He also uses it in Truc. 61 (elsewhere, Plautus uses the abl. (Merc. 982), *ne* (Stich. 117), the infin. (Poen. 22, 33, 1036) and absolute 3 times.

Ubi primum: though avoided by Cicero and Nepos, it is the favorite with Sallust and Caesar (Archiv 14 (1905), p. 239). It was regarded with favor by Livy also, another departure from the Ciceronian norm, being used 30 times, to *cum primum* 14 and *ut pr.* only 5 (7, 6, 11; 25, 26, 13; 36, 19, 3; 41, 2, 1; 42, 1, 8). On the other hand, Pliny the younger does not use *ubi primum* at all, but *ut pr.* 7 times (1, 9, 7; 3, 6, 6; 6, 6, 5; 8, 3, 2; 9, 16, 2; 10, 3, 1; 9, 1).

Ut qui: According to Draeger II², p. 537 *ut qui* was used 18 times by Livy, but, as a matter of fact it was used 36 times, *quippe qui* 28 times. Cf. Lease to Livy, Praef., l. 3.

Velle ut: found as early as Plautus (Bacch. 989a). This passage, as also Cic. De Or. 3, 228, Sulla 1, Phil. 8, 31, Fam. 4, 14, 4, and Firm. Mat. De Err. Prof. Rel. 19, 2 (p. 47, Z.) and Aug. Conf. 9, 4 (Kn.), is omitted by Draeger II², p. 255. The paratactic construction is found in Pliny the Younger as follows: after *volo*, pres. subj. in 7, 9, 8 (*bis*); after *velim* pres. subj. in 3, 19, 9; 5, 12, 4; 6, 8, 8; 8, 24, 10; after *vellem*, the impf. subj. in 4, 15, 8; the plupf. in 6, 34, 3.

Veri similis: the Antib¹. should have cited Landgraf's note to Reisig-H., Vorles., p. 621. Here, however, *similia veris* is incorrectly cited for Livy 6, 20, 4 (6, 12, 4 = *simile veri*), and so, also, Livy 29, 21, 1 for 29, 20, 1. For *veri similis*, he, as also M. Mueller, Livy II, p. 150 says, "2 mal": the expression is found 3 times (5, 11, 7; 9, 37, 7; 38, 55, 9). Furthermore, *similia veris* is also found in Livy 5, 21, 9.

In Quintilian *simile veri* is used 12 times (Haustein, p. 39 f. omits 2, 17, 39 (*bis*), 4, 2, 31 (*bis*), 8, 3, 70 and cites 2, 17, 19 for 2, 17, 39), *simile vero* but once (2, 4, 2). Cf. also, for the latter, Plin. N. H. 16, 220.

Versa vice (instead of the modern form, which appears first in Isidorus, Archiv 5, p. 587), is found, according to the Antib¹, 'first in Sen., then in Gell.': cf., however, Justin 13, 1, 7; 16, 4, 18. Note its use also in Oros. 1, 14, 2; 2, 10, 3; 3, 20, 9; 5, 7, 10 and 6, 3, 3.

EMORY B. LEASE.

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

IV.—CROSS-SUGGESTION: A FORM OF TACITEAN BRACHYLOGY.

The rhetorical device, "suggestion by contrast", based on certain obvious psychological facts and experiences, is familiar to students of Horace. Prof. C. L. Smith (*Odes of Horace*, Introd., p. lxxi, § 122) defines it: "Where a twofold contrast exists between two objects, it may be indicated by attributing to them single qualities which do not match. Each quality will then suggest its opposite in the other object; as Carm. III 13, 6 *gelidos inficiet tibi rubro sanguine rivos*, where the (clear) cold water is contrasted with the (warm) red blood. Carm. II 3, 9 *quo pinus ingens albaque populus umbram hospitalem consociare amant | ramis*; i. e., the tall (dark) pine and the (shorter) white poplar". I may say in passing that the difficult lines, Carm. III 23, 17-18 may receive light from this principle: *immunis aram si tetigit manus | non sumptuosa blandior hostia*; i. e., the (innocent) and giftless hand is contrasted with the hand of the sinner bearing a costly gift. Cf. for the religious principle involved, I Samuel 15, 22: Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. Another familiar example from Horace occurs in Sat. I 1, 1-2, where *nemo* suggests *unusquisque* as the subject of *laudet*, which is contrasted with *contentus vivat*. So also in vss. 118-119, *qui nemo . . . se probet ac potius laudet diversa sequentis*. A sister principle to "suggestion by contrast" is "suggestion by similarity". This form of "ellipsis" in the wider sense is defined by Prof. Smith (l. l. § 121): "Where two or more qualities belong to a series of objects, the poet is sometimes content to express one with each, leaving the rest to suggestion". Examples, Horace Ep. I 16, 50; Epod. 5, 37.

Sometimes Horace combines suggestion by similarity with suggestion by contrast; e. g., Carm. I 21, 7-8, *nigris aut Erymanthi silvis aut viridis Cragi*; dark (green) and (light) green are the respective shades. From the cases cited below it will be seen that, as used by Tacitus, the qualities from which the suggestion arises, are often placed in a series, but also in a sort

of antithesis, and that besides suggestion by similarity, suggestion by contrast may be involved. Technically considered this device is a brachylogy of the type called *constructio ad sensum* in its broader meaning. It is susceptible of a number of variations, not being limited in use to contrasted objects but applicable also to contrasted ideas.¹ Hence it may appear as ellipsis, syllepsis, zeugma, etc. Inasmuch as many obscure and difficult passages seem to me to find their key in this principle of style, an analysis and subjective interpretation of a few of them may show how the text may be explained without recourse to emendation.

In treating of brachylogy, Quintilian, Inst. Or. VIII 3, 82 says, *huic subiacet virtus non solum aperte ponendi rem ante oculos sed circumcise atque velociter. ac merito laudatur brevitatis integritas ea minus praestat quotiens nihil dicit nisi quod necesse est* (*βραχυλογίαν* vocant quae redditur inter schemata) *est vero pulcherrima cum plura paucis complectitur: quale Sallustii est, Mithradates corpore ingenti, proinde armatus. Hoc male imitantes sequitur obscuritas.*

Without knowing the context of the quotation from Sallust we cannot be sure of the full implication. If *proinde* = *proinde ac si esset*, then *proinde armatus* is almost the same as *sine armis* or *inermis*. But the contrast between his powerful physique (his great natural means of defence and offence) and his less adequate means of offence (*armatus* used absolutely is frequent in this sense, although it may also include defensive arms as is shown in a definition in Cic. Caec. 60 *scutis telisque parati*, but cf. the examples in the Thesaurus L. L. col. 620-621) might suggest that he was comparatively unarmed. The reference to his huge physique also suggests an opponent or opponents of inferior size and armed to better advantage. Cf. Tac., Agr.

¹ Examples from the Greek are: Soph. Ajax 1211 ff., *καὶ πρὶν μὲν ἐν νυχτίου | δείματος ἦν μοι προβολὰ | καὶ βελέων θούριος Αἴας*—where on the analogy of Psalm xci. 5, Thou shalt not be afraid for the *terror by night*; nor for the *arrow that flieth by day*, one naturally thinks of *βελέων ἡμερησίων* (*ἀμερασίων*). Soph. Ajax 1326 f., *οὐ φήσ' ἔασσιν τόνδε τὸν νεκρὸν ταφῆς | ἄμωρον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς βίαν θάψειν ἐμοῦ*. Soph. O. T. 241, *ὠθεῖν* depends on an *αὐδῶ* supplied from *ἀπαυδῶ* (= veto) in 236. Herod. 7, 104, *οὐκ ἔδωκ φεύγειν ἀλλὰ μένοντας . . . ἐπικρατεῖν*. An instance in Terence, Andria 620 occurs to me, which may go back to the Greek: *qui me hodie ex tranquillissima re coniecisti in nuptias*—a state of (single) blessedness contrasted with an (unhappy) marriage. Instances might be cited from Livy, e. g., I praef. 10, where (something good) is understood with *quod imitere* from *foedum . . . quod viles*.

37, *catervae armatorum paucioribus terga praestare*, quidam inermes ultro ruere ac se morti offerre. If *proinde* = in like manner, then the suggestion may be from similarity, "of powerful physique and powerfully armed." Clearly then in interpreting obscure passages which are susceptible of such analysis, we cannot be certain as to how far the principle of suggestion is to be applied. On the other hand, while the grammatical interpretation may be possible and apparently adequate, without calling in the aid of such a rhetorical principle, the subjective and individual interpretation of an author may make the application not only permissible but even necessary. In impressionistic writing as in painting much is left to the imagination. *Hoc male imitantes sequitur obscuritas*. In the case of a stylist like Tacitus, who affected *varietas*, *brevitas* and *color poeticus* (Boetticher, Lex. Tac. proleg., p. lxvi) there is much obscurity, not a little of which is dispelled by a knowledge of his favorite tricks of expression. In the variation of his phrase-forms he uses more than a hundred different types, his brevity is obtained by a bewildering use of ellipsis, syllepsis and zeugma, as well as by economy of thought through epithet and suggestion, while the poetic effects range all the way from quotation and imitation of the poets to rhythmical cadences.

The object of the present paper is to examine a number of passages in the *Agricola* and *Germania*, in order to show on the one hand the application of the principle of suggestion by contrast and similarity as a natural and legitimate means of interpretation, and on the other hand to explain the text of the MSS tradition without recourse to emendation.

As an illustration of how common this brachylogy is in Latin take the phrase *domi militiaeque*, where the contrasted words have the effect of (in peace) at home and in war (abroad). Yet Tacitus uses the phrase but once (*Hist.* III 75, 2) and the words in antithesis only once (*Ann.* IV 67). Elsewhere he contrasts *domi* with *bellum*, *bellis*, *bellis externis*, *externis rebus*, *adversus externa*, *foris* (see G. and G. Lex. Tac. s. *domus*, p. 314 B), a fact which bears evidence of this author's fondness for avoiding the commonplace by variation, while at the same time it shows his fondness for this schema.

The suppression of details which could be supplied by the reader's imagination was a part of the writer's literary art, as Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* VIII 3, 64) commenting on Cic. in Verrem

5, 33 observes: An quisquam tam procul a concipiendis imaginibus rerum abest, ut non cum illa in Verrem legit; *stetit soleatus praetor populi Romani cum pallio purpureo tunicaque talari muliercula nixus in litore*, non solum ipsos intueri videatur et locum et habitum sed quaedam etiam ex iis, quae dicta non sunt, sibi ipsi astruat? Ego certe mihi cernere videor et vultum et oculos et deformes utriusque blanditias et eorum, qui aderant, tacitam aversionem ac timidam verecundiam. Cf. also §§ 67-69.

The cases cited below are arranged not in the order of interest but in their order of occurrence.

Agr. 1. at nunc narraturo mihi vitam defuncti hominis venia opus fuit, quam non petissem incusaturus tam saeva et infesta virtutibus tempora. The suggestions by contrast and similarity if expressed would fill out the text somewhat as follows: But nowadays (in contrast with the days of the republic) as I was about to write (a eulogy of) the (virtuous) life of a man who has passed away, I have had need of (asking) indulgence. I should not have asked it (now) (from any necessity) if I had been going to complain (in invective) against times (just passed) so cruel and hostile to high qualities.

Agr. 2. scilicet illo igne vocem populi Romani et libertatem senatus et conscientiam generis humani aboleri arbitrabantur. By similarity the suggestion is: vocem (sc. *liberam*, from *libertatem*) populi Romani et libertatem (sc. *agendi* sugg. by *vocare* in *vocem*) senatus (sc. *Romani*) et conscientiam (sc. *libere expressam*, sugg. by the *libertatem* and *vocem*). The free expression of what is the common knowledge of mankind is before the mind more prominently than the free possession of that knowledge.

Agr. 2. sicut vetus aetas vidit quid ultimum in libertate esset, ita nos (sc. *huius recentioris aetatis*) (vidimus) quid . . . (sc. *ultimum esset*) a simple ellipsis in the second member of two contrasted clauses, where the similarity of thought makes the meaning obvious. Such cases as Agr. 37 circumire coeperant (sc. et circumissent) ni . . . opposuisset (cf. Agr. 4, 13), where the contrast in mode suggests the nonfulfillment of the action or state, present less difficulty because of the idiom which soon became evolved.

Agr. 4. Massiliam . . . locum Graeca comitate et provinciali parsimonia mixtum. By contrast, from *Graeca* understand *Romana* as if the phrase were *Romanae provinciae parsimonia*,

from the adjective *provinciali* understand *urbis* as if the phrase were: *urbis Graecae comitate*; for *comitas* is a quality characteristic of Greek city culture whereas *parsimonia* we might well associate with a Roman province.

Agr. 5. nec minus periculum ex magna fama quam ex mala. The suggestion is by contrast: *magna* = great (and good) while *mala* = (even a small) evil reputation. The antithesis is between a great and good reputation and any sort of a reputation bad in the eyes of Nero. *In translating it is not necessary to bring out these suggestions, the analysis and interpretation will explain and evaluate them.*

Agr. 6. ludos et inania honoris medio rationis atque abundantiae duxit. Similarity of meaning suggests (*edidit*) with *ludos* from *duxit* while from *ludos* (*munera*) may be supplied with *inania honoris*. This form of the brachylogy is commonly known as zeugma.

Agr. 10. ita quae priores nondum comperta eloquentia percoluere, rerum fide tradentur. From *priores* understand (*a me*) with *tradentur*, from *nondum comperta* understand (*ea nunc demum explorata*) as subject of *tradentur*, from *rerum fide* understand with *eloquentia* (*tantum sed citra fidem*. Cf. Agr. 1) while *eloquentia* itself suggests with *rerum fide* (*sed incondita et rudi voce*. Cf. Agr. 3 end).

Agr. 12. in pedite robur, quaedam nationes et curru proeliantur, honestior auriga, clientes propugnant. From *clientes* understand (*princeps*) with *auriga*, from *propugnant* we get the suggestion that it is in battle that the chief drives; it is evident that some of the clients fight in the chariot. The *clientes* are also held in less esteem. (The chieftain) who drives the chariot (in time of battle) is held in more esteem than those who do the actual fighting, that is, his vassals, who fight from the chariot by his side or on the ground.

Agr. 15. alterius manum centuriones, alterius servos vim et contumelias miscere. The similarity of thought causes *manum* to be understood with *alterius* in the second member; *servos* suggests to *centuriones* the notion that these subordinate officers are likewise the 'minions' of the governor; while from *centuriones* the word *servos* acquires the additional connotation, that the procurators use these slaves as their rough and ready quasi-official representatives.

Agr. 20. sed ubi aestas advenit, contracto exercitu, multus in agmine, laudare modestiam, disiectos coërcere. In the last part the antithesis is heightened by chiasmus and the variation from abstract to concrete. *Modestiam* is the characteristic of the orderly (the opposite of *disiectos*), while *modestiam* suggests the disobedience or lack of control of the stragglers. Again *laudare* suggests an idea of blame to be joined with *coërcere*, while *coërcere* seems to throw back on to *laudare* its opposite, some notion of freedom or immunity, to reinforce the words of praise. Evidently any literary style which requires the mind to apprehend so much that is hinted at rather than explicitly expressed must be read slowly, and there is reason to believe that the ancients themselves found Tacitus far from easy reading.

Agr. 24. idque etiam adversus Britanniam profuturum, si Romana ubique arma et velut e conspectu libertas tolleretur. *e conspectu* suggests *in conspectu* or *palam* with *ubique*; *tolleretur* suggests its opposite *inferrentur*; while *Romana* suggests *Britannorum* with *libertas*.

Agr. 25. hinc terra et hostis, hinc victus Oceanus militari iactantia compararentur. This is a case of suggestion by similarity in an antithesis. *Hostis* suggests for Oceanus the hostile Ocean or perhaps the enemy by sea; more strictly victory over the enemy by sea or by approach by sea (cf. above, *portus classe exploravit quae . . . sequebatur egregia specie, cum simul terra, simul mari bellum impelleretur*). On the other hand *victus* must be understood with *hostis*, as the effect is victory over the land and the enemy, although the emphasis in the former more analytic phrase is more on the difficulties of the land march.

Agr. 29. quem casum neque ut plerique fortium virorum ambitiose neque per lamenta rursus ac maerorem muliebriter tulit. We notice first the variation in point of view and length of phrase in *ut plerique fortium virorum* over against *muliebriter*, and *ambitiose* over against *per lamenta ac maerorem*. "Not a few brave men" suggests "all the weaker sex" for *muliebriter*; "ostentatiously" (i. e. in such a manner as to attract popular attention by a stolid reserve and Stoical indifference to grief) suggests natural and complete abandonment to grief without regard to public opinion, as the full content of the contrasted phrases.

Agr. 33. . . . pulchrum et decorum in frontem, ita fugientibus periculosissima quae hodie prosperrima sunt. From *fugientibus* understand *progredientibus* with *in frontem*, from *in frontem* understand *in tergum* (cf. Hist. 3, 38, 17) with *fugientibus*, or some such idea as *ex acie* or *retro* (cf. the various interpretations of this passage in the note of Furneaux ad loc.).

Agr. 35. legiones pro vallo stetero, ingens victoriae decus citra Romanum sanguinem bellandi (bellanti, Rhenanus, Halm) et auxilium si pellerentur. Here the antithesis suggests the construction, *victoriae* = *si vicissent* (from *si pellerentur*) *citra Romanum sanguinem* suggests *cohortibus ceteris* with *auxilium*.

Agr. 37. quod ni frequens ubique Agricola validas et expeditas cohortes indaginis modo et sicubi artiora erant, partem equitum dimissis equis, simul rariores silvas equitem persultare iussisset, acceptum aliquod vulnus per nimiam fiduciam foret. From *persultare* (A. T. *perlustrari* B) we must understand by "zeugma" some general neuter verb, *agere*, *progredi* with *cohortes*, with *partem* either the *persultare* of the text or *pedibus perambulare*. The contrast with variation of construction (as common in Tacitus) requires *rariores* = *sicubi rariores erant*. The phrase *partem equitum dimissis equis* requires *equitem* = *partem equitum equis invectam*; i. e., mounted. As is often the case, the writer's desire for variation in the form of phrase as well as his straining after brevity has led him to adopt this mannerism of artistic suggestion.

Agr. 38. vastum ubique silentium, secreti colles, fumantia procul tecta, nemo exploratoribus obviis. The second member alone has two, not three, words. *Secretus* is a favorite of Tacitus (cf. Gerber and Greef, Lex. Tac.). In Germ. 35 the idea of "peace and quiet" is obtained by adding *quietus*: (Chauci) sine cupiditate, sine impatientia, quieti secretique nulla provocant. In the present instance through suggestion by similarity *silentium* is carried over to *secreti colles*, while the idea of solitude in *se-creti* reinforces the preceding phrase, where it is not explicitly expressed. The picture called up before the mind of the reader is therefore somewhat as follows: everywhere is the silence of solitude and desolation; the hills once noisy and swarming with the hordes of the enemy are now silent, deserted and solitary. Thus the opposite is conjured up before the mind, just as in Quintilian VIII 67-69 the single word *expugnatum* in its context recalls all the horrors of the sack of a city.

Agr. 38. *Britanni . . . trahere vulneratos, vocare integros.* Similarity in the two contrasted phrases suggests: (*integri*) *trahere vulneratos* (*vulnerati*) *vocare integros.* Of course we cannot exclude the case (*integri*) *vocare integros*, which would obviously occur in the attempts at rally or more organized retreat.

Agr. 45. *nos Maurici Rusticique visus, nos innocenti sanguine Senecio perfudit.* The contrast between the figurative and literal use suggests *horrore perfudit* from the following *sanguine perfudit.* In the same way *Maurici Rusticique visus* suggests with changed construction, *Senecio* (sc. *occisus*). For this use of *perfundere*, cf. Cic. ep. ad Att. VIII 6, 3 *qui me horror perfudit.* Cf. Cic. de Fin. V 24, 70.

There are several passages where the application of this principle may help in the establishing of the correct reading.

Agr. 31. *Brigantes, femina duce, exurere coloniam, expugnare castra, ac nisi felicitas in socordiam vertisset, exuere iugum potuere; nos integri et indomiti et libertatem non in paenitentiam lataturi . . . ostendamus, etc.* Charles Knapp (*Proceed. Amer. Philol. Assn.*, vol. 33, pp. xlix-l) reads as above by simply omitting the *in* (in the MSS) before *libertatem*. This reading may also be defended by applying the principle of suggestion by contrast. *Brigantes* (sc. *gens una*) *femina duce . . . nos* (sc. *omnium civitatum vires* (c. 29) *viro duce*). . . *Nisi felicitas in socordiam vertisset* (sc. *ita ut minus valerent*) is contrasted with *integri* (sc. *socordiae*); *indomiti et libertatem lataturi* is contrasted with the idea of (*iugum servitutis ferre coacti*) implied in *exuere iugum potuere nisi*; *non in paenitentiam* is contrasted with *felicitas in socordiam vertisset*, which implies that the Brigantes grew tired of their independence which they could just as well as not have maintained and that they preferred to take upon themselves the Roman yoke. So by a shift of ideas *libertatem lataturi* implies *libertatem* (*non iugum*) *lataturi*. This series of contrasts might be still further elaborated.

Agr. 44. *opibus nimiis non gaudebat; speciosae contigerant; i. e., opibus nimiis (quae ei non contigerant) non gaudebat; speciosae (sed non nimiae opes, quibus revera gaudebat) contigerant.* If this be a fair interpretation, there is no necessity for emending with Rhenanus and others to *non contigerant*.

Agr. 44. *nam sicuti durare in hanc beatissimi saeculi lucem ac principem Traianum videre ita festinatae mortis grande solacium*

tulit evasisse e. q. s. For *sicuti* read *sicut ei*. *Ei* suggests (*nobis*) to be understood with *grande solacium tulit* below, while the latter phrase suggests by syllepsis and similarity of thought (*grande solacium tulisset*) with *ei*; for the dawn of the new era would have compensated him for his enforced endurance of the Terror which he was not destined to see ended. If this interpretation be correct, there is no necessity for emending with Dahl and others, by supplying *non licuit* with the first member.

Agr. 15. plus impetus felicibus, maiorem constantiam penes miseros esse. The Toledo MS and the newly found "E" of the library of Conte G-Balliani in Iesi, supply *felicibus* needed for the sense of this passage. Before this I had tried in a very unsatisfactory way to interpret on the principle of cross-suggestion, rather than resort to emendation; e. g., *integris* or the like. *impetus*, offence, initiative, and the impulse to push on and complete a work, is a positive quality, whereas *constantiam*, the resolution to stand firm on the defence, is a negative or at least a neutral quality. On the analogy of such usages as Livy II 51, quo plures erant, maior caedes fuit (for other examples see Draeger Hist. Synt. d. lat. Spr. II, p. 655) one might attempt to explain the sense by supposing that Tacitus had, in a striving after brevity, suppressed the *quo* before *plus* leaving it to the reader to supply the necessary antithesis by cross-suggestion, from *penes miseros*; i. e., Let them not be dismayed by the issue of one or two battles (with the Romans) (the) more impulse (to fight), (the) greater resolution on the part of their victims. Or put as it used to stand in the text: more offence, more defence on the part of the poor wretches. Hence *penes miseros* suggests *victoribus* or *felicibus*. Of course, unless, as some have supposed, *felicibus* is itself an emendation of great antiquity, there is now no longer need of resorting to the principle of cross-suggestion.

In the Germania there are a large number of cases where cross-suggestion is probably intended; at any rate the application of this *σχημα* may help solve some of the difficulties. Among the more interesting are the following.

Germ. 2. Quis . . . Asia aut Africa aut Italia relictæ, Germaniam peteret, informem terris, asperam caelo, tristem cultu aspectuque e. q. s. May not the contrast suggest (fertile) Asia, (the clear sky of) Africa and (civilized and sunny) Italy? The

abuse of such retroaction is illustrated by the following distich of Hildebert, Bishop of Tours 1056-1133:

Durus eques, iudex rigidus, plebs libera quondam
Quaerit, amat, patitur otia lucra iugum.

Evidently the construction is *durus eques quaerit otia, iudex rigidus amat lucra, plebs libera quondam patitur iugum*. (C. Pascal, *Poesia Latina Medievale*, p. 45.)

Germ. 4. *magna corpora et tantum ad impetum valida; laboris atque operum non eadem patientia*. *valida* = able (and willing—a suggestion from *non eadem patientia*); *laboris* (contrasted with *impetum*; i. e., sudden effort) = continued toil as cause; *operum* the effect, the production of buildings, tilled fields, military works and the like. The implication then is: they have big physiques and are able and willing to undergo sudden violent exertion, but they are neither able (suggested by *valida*) nor willing to undergo sustained toil so as to produce works that last.

Germ. 4. *minime sitim aestumque tolerare, frigora atque inedia caelo solove adsueverunt*. With *tolerare* supply *adsueverunt* and with the latter the former; *minime* suggests *sed maxime* with the second member. With the first member *caelo* is thought of as rainy weather and *solo* as a well-watered soil; with the last member *caelo* is thought of as frosty weather and *solo* as a comparatively unproductive land. The effect then is: Being used to a rainy climate and a well-watered land they dislike the sensations of heat and thirst, and having become inured to low temperatures and the scanty crops of a naturally unproductive soil, they are accustomed to bear cold and an insufficiency of food.

Germ. 4. *terra etsi aliquanto specie differt, in universum tamen aut silvis horrida aut paludibus foeda*. *specie* = in appearance (and by contrast with *in universum*, also "in detail"; i. e., in details of appearance; but cf. Dial. 25, 18: *nec refert quod inter se specie differunt, cum genere consentiant*). On the other hand it is possible to attach to *in universum* the notion of *aspectu* carried over from *specie*.

Germ. 4. *umidior qua Gallias, ventosior qua Noricum ac Panoniam aspicit*. *umidior* = damper (and less windy) *ventosior* = windier (and less damp). Instances of this class are so common in all sorts of style that they need not be multiplied here. Doubtless in many of them there is no cross-suggestion intended,

inasmuch as only the salient qualities of the objects mentioned are described. Yet in many cases the adjectives belong to entirely different spheres or categories, and seem to reinforce each other.

Germ. 4. *satis ferax, frugiferarum arborum impatiens*. We may not be going too far in inferring from the contrasted *ferax* and *impatiens*: It not only bears crops of grain but produces them in abundance, whereas it is not naturally adapted to fruit-bearing trees, and the quantity of fruit produced is scanty. Cf. c. 10 of the lots made from a branch of a fruit-bearing tree, "fruit" being used in a broad sense.

Germ. 6. *rari gladiis aut maioribus lanceis utuntur; hastas vel ipsorum vocabulo frameas gerunt*. *Rari* suggests (*plerique*) with *hastas gerunt*; *maioribus* suggests (*minores*) with *hastas*.

Germ. 14. *nec arare terram aut exspectare annum tam facile persuaseris quam vocare hostem et vulnera mereri*. For this use of *annus*, cf. Agr. 31, *ager et annus*. The "yearly crop" is meant, what will result from the process *arare terram* and the other agricultural operations. Hence *arare terram* receives by contrast the notion of plow (and sow) the earth. The lapse of time implied in *exspectare annum* suggests to the mind the obviously proper time for beginning to plow and plant, to be mentally supplied with *arare terram*. Moreover, the agricultural term, *arare terram* paired off with the poetical *exspectare annum*, suggests for the latter the other duties of the tiller of the soil, which occupy his attention until the time of reaping. Again *vocare hostem* receives from *vulnera* the idea of *provocare hostem ad pugnam* (the preliminary to fighting is the challenge, just as plowing and planting are to reaping; *vulnera mereri* expresses the result, *vulnera quasi mercedem accipere*—the wounds come as an answer to the challenge—*vocare*. Hence *vocare hostem* is also contrasted with *arare terram*, the preliminary operation pointing to an expected result; *vulnera mereri* (a poetic phrase) is also contrasted with *exspectare annum* (another poetic phrase); the expected crop comes after the long wait after the preliminary plowing and planting, the wounds come as the expected result of battle, for which they would necessarily look in challenging the enemy to fight.

Germ. 22. *in conviviis consultant, tamquam si nullo magis tempore aut ad simplices cogitationes pateat animus aut ad magnas incalescat*. The contrast suggests "direct expressions of opinion

(in minor matters) and important projects (of a more complicated or delicate nature)."

Germ. 27. *sepulcrum caespes erigit; monumentorum arduum et operosum honorem ut gravem defunctis aspernantur.* The contrast between German and Roman custom is then as follows: the light common sod is used to raise their simple burial mounds, whereas among the Romans, lofty, elaborate, pretentious, tombs of stone receive the dead.

Examples enough have been discussed to make plain the frequency and almost myriad variety of form and use of this stylistic device in these two early works of Tacitus. In applying the principle there is great latitude possible. Where quantity is contrasted with quality, abstract with concrete, literal with figurative, moral with physical, subjective with objective, the mind of a discriminating reader cannot fail at times to be arrested, now by a feeling of surprise at an incongruity or a lack of concinnity, now by a certain picturesqueness in the impressionism, now with the poetic color, and again with an effect perhaps closely akin to the humorous. Many of these characteristics are really inherent in the Latin language, which is fond of economy of expression. The Roman had a habit of including several ideas in a single clause, where in English we should employ as many sentences. But a literary artist like Tacitus¹ mixed upon his palette a great variety of pigments, applying them to his canvas with a studied deliberation, as if he constantly stepped back from his easel, to get the best effects of *chiaroscuro* and symmetry. In this way Tacitus has evolved a style which not only calls forth the admiration of the casual reader but is a constant source of surprise to those who will take the time to analyze it.

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

¹J. Vainey, *Quomodo dici potest Tacitum fuisse summum pingendi artificem*, Parisiis 1896, discusses Tacitus' power of visualizing, his manner of arranging the central and minor parts of his pictures, his choice of subjects, and his style as compared with that of other writers. The dissertation does not treat of his purely rhetorical devices.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

RECENT LITERATURE ON ANCIENT ANIMAL NAMES AND EFFIGIES.

Attention has frequently been called to the difficulty of identifying with certainty many of the species of animals and plants mentioned by ancient authors or depicted in minor art productions that have come down to us from remote antiquity. That the theme is a fertile one, commanding the interest and inviting the coöperation alike of classical and natural history students, none will deny. We may be permitted in the present article to take note of some recent contributions to the literature of this subject, our purpose being less a presentation of original results than an attempt to show along what lines investigation may profitably be conducted, and what sort of problems and difficulties are to be encountered.

To begin on native ground. In an address before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in 1860, as printed in the fourth volume of the Proceedings of that body, the late Professor Sophocles of Harvard remarks as follows:

"Few things connected with Greek philology present more perplexity to the scholar than the identification of plants and animals whose names occur in ancient Greek authors. With regard to the Greek naturalists, as a common rule, they were content to mention some of the most striking peculiarities of plants and animals. Minuteness of observation and accuracy of description were apparently undervalued by most of them. Consequently they had no *technical language* properly so called; the popular language of the day being deemed sufficiently definite for their purpose. And as each Greek city had its local peculiarities, it was natural that more local names than one should be employed to designate a given species."

Elsewhere in the same communication occurs this passage:

"A considerable number of plants and animals mentioned by ancient Greek authors may be identified with the help of the modern language of Greece, as spoken by the common people, provided the following proposition be admitted; that *when the ancient name of a plant or animal is still heard among the Greeks, the presumption is that it is the traditional name of that plant or animal.*"

About the same time, Cornelius Felton, former President of Harvard, a noted Philhellene of whom Lowell said that he "was Greek to the finger-tips", records with regret in his first edition of the Aves (1861) that a considerable portion of the birds of Athens' great comic poet still remain unidentified; and this, too, notwithstanding the aid had been invoked of no less eminent a

naturalist than Louis Agassiz in an effort to determine them. Felton likewise, in commenting on Agassiz's rediscovery of the γλάνις of Aristotle (= *Parasilurus* of modern systematists), maintains with Professor Sophocles that "the ancient names of birds, fishes and quadrupeds, in numerous instances, are preserved among the common people, under forms modified in the same way as other classes of words are by the uneducated."¹

After a half century of progress we find a philologist of our own day addressing the Congress of Arts and Science at St. Louis on The Problems of Greek, and referring to the matter of biological nomenclature in these words:²

"The names of animals and plants are troublesome. The αἰλουρος and γαλῆ, with the later κάττα and κάττος, have a literature of their own, and yet the cat problem remains unsolved. Despite volumes on Greek birds, the make-up of the chorus in the Aves is not altogether settled. . . ."

Numerous other testimonials of like nature might be given. Not only is it true that volumes have been written on Greek birds—some of them very estimable, as witness D'Arcy W. Thompson's Glossary of Greek Birds (1895)—but ichthyological names in particular have been carefully investigated by both naturalists and philologists from the time of Scaliger onward. Noteworthy among the older works is J. G. Schneider's Synonymia Piscium graeca et latina (1789), published as an extension and emendation of a like-named essay of Peter Artedi, father of modern systematic ichthyology. Among recent contributions to the same subject may be mentioned Jordan and Hoffmann's Catalogue of the Fishes of Greece (1892), and Krumbacher's elucidation of a newly-found thirteenth century "Fishbook" (1906). Additional references to the literature of this topic will be found in articles contributed to Science for 1905-7 by Dr. Theodore Gill and the present writer.

But to pass on from the birds and fishes, let us consider the higher vertebrates. In spite of the vast amount of effort that has been expended since Cuvier's or since Darwin's time in tracing the history of the different animals domesticated by man, the "cat problem" to which Professor Humphreys alludes is by no means the only one remaining unsolved. With regard to this very matter Otto Keller of Innsbruck remarks as follows in a recent instructive article:³ "Die Geschichte der Katze gehört zu den interessantesten, aber auch zu den schwierigsten Kapiteln der Kulturgeschichte überhaupt. Es scheint, man kann nicht vorsichtig genug sein". This admission is the more significant

¹ Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci. (1861) 4, p. 334.

² Milton W. Humphreys, The Problems of Greek, Cong. Arts Sci., St. Louis Expos. (1906), 3, p. 165.

³ Keller, Zur Geschichte der Katze im Altertum, Mitt. deutsch. Arch. Inst., Röm. Abth. (1908), 23, p. 40. Cf. also his Thiere des classischen Alterthums (1887). Wessely, K., Woher stammt die Katze? Urania, 1909.

considering that it is from the author of an extensive series of contributions to the history of feral and domestic animals in antiquity,¹ and estimating at their full value the enlightening researches along similar lines by his namesake Dr. Conrad Keller of Zürich (*Die Abstammung der älteren Haustiere*, 1902), and of Eduard Hahn and Victor Hehn (*Die Haustiere und ihre Beziehungen zur Wirtschaft des Menschen*, 1896; *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, 6th ed., 1894).

Somewhat analogous to the cat problem is the question as to the antiquity of the lion in Greece, this being one of the four large quadrupeds which have become extinct in that country since the period of Athenian supremacy. The identity of the Urus or Aurochs, which persisted in Europe as late as the sixteenth century, has long been a perplexing topic around which has grown up a considerable literature. Those interested in the latest phase of the discussion will do well to consult A. B. Meyer's article on the lion in Greece, and Yermoleff's on the Caucasian bison, reprinted in the Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institution for the years 1903 and 1906 respectively. It may not be amiss to recall in this connection that the distinguished French zoologist, Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, contributed a very readable essay on leonine species formerly inhabiting Hellas.²

It would be an easy but thankless task to multiply illustrations of this sort, for the fact is sufficiently evident that our knowledge of ancient natural history matters is in many respects imperfect and confused. Reviewing the individual classic authors, one finds that the animals of Homer, Herodotus³ and Aristotle have received very considerable attention, whereas relatively little has been bestowed upon the rest, save for an occasional disquisition on the fish-names occurring among the scriptores minores.⁴

Nor, with the exception of the now antiquated work of H. O. Lenz on the Zoology of the Greeks and Romans (1856), has there been any comprehensive and adequate exposition of the same theme. As compared with the Hierozoicon of Bochart, a really marvellous repository of information on biblical animals, and the most authoritative work of its kind, the deficiency is noteworthy and regrettable. For the compilation of such a work special aptitude and training are, of course, necessary; or, as a

¹ An idea of the extent of the special literature that has accumulated during recent years may be had on consulting the general index of Bursian's *Jahresberichte* (1898).

² *Expéd. Scient. de Morée* (1833), 3, p. 34 ff.

³ Benecke, *Ueber die Thiere des Herodots*, *Wissensch. Monatshefte*, 1879.

⁴ This predilection for investigating ichthyological names extends also to Semitic and other oriental writings. Compare, for example, H. Lenz, *Die semitischen Fremdwörter im Griechischen* (1895). I. Löw, *Aramäische Fischnamen*, in Nöldeke's Anniversary Volume (1906, 1, p. 549 ff.). Delitzsch, *Assyrische Thiernamen* (1874). F. Hommel, *Die Namen der Säugethiere bei den süd-semitischen Völkern* (1879). J. J. Köhler, *Die altenglischen Fischnamen* (1906).

learned critic (A. Rüge) has said, "tiefdringende naturwissenschaftliche und philologische Kenntnisse zusammen sind dazu nötige Vorbedingungen". The necessary qualifications for such a task were possessed in high degree by two eminent German zoologists who have recently deceased: the late J. Victor Carus, whose *History of Zoology* is a standard treatise, and Rudolf Burckhardt, author of a short compendium on the same subject, and of numerous suggestive articles on primal biological science (*Ueber antike Biologie*; *Das koische System*, etc.).

In studying the zoological notices and allusions of a given classic author one turns first of all for aid to the critical notes and commentaries supplied by various editors and recensers of the text. For instance, in the case of the Aves, one will note carefully the Agassizian identifications given by Felton, and determine whether any of these should be modified in the light of the newer conclusions of Benjamin B. Rogers, embodied in his edition of 1906. An inquirer will in the next place consult the special glossaries that have been prepared of Greek and Latin animal names, checking his results with the aid of those systematic works—and of these there are many excellent ones—which deal with the fauna of the two peninsulas. Lastly our investigator, if he has sufficient patience and a liberal sense of that "curiosité permanente et empressée" which the genial philosopher of Périgord enjoins upon us, will not disdain laying under contribution the endless series of inaugural dissertations, *Schulprogramme*, *Promotionsreden*, and varying assortment of serious and dilettante articles in classical and scientific periodicals. It is in this way that contributions of real and permanent value have been produced, such, for instance, as the critical commentaries on Aristotle's *Historia animalium* (a new one by L. Dittmeyer has only recently made its appearance), or the late Hugo Berger's *Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erdkunde der Griechen* (2d ed., 1903), or Hugo Bretzl's treatise on Botanical Knowledge resulting from the Alexandrian Conquest (1903).

A word of caution, however, as to the trustworthiness of the conclusions put forward by amateur essayists. Too often these are lacking in critical insight or discernment, or there is insufficient foundation of fact, or the meaning of the facts themselves is misconceived, or again the extraordinary, the fantastic and the far-fetched is preferred to the familiar, simple and plausible, or yet again it may be that a spirit of vanity disinclines one to be satisfied with results that are neither novel nor positive in character; all of which is inimical to that state of mind which is content, when conditions demand it, to hold judgment in suspension. Common sense conclusions are always safest, and conjectures which are chiefly remarkable for their ingenuity, and partake of the nature of a contest in the art of guessing, never fail to arouse scepticism. Wisely declared Hippocrates: "The

sinews and fibres of knowledge consist in believing nothing rashly."

It is a common rule of logic that the improbable is always to be distrusted. But preliminary to the application of this principle to the matter in hand it is necessary to know what constitutes the improbability of an alleged fact or conclusion. Precisely here are seen the advantages of special equipment, and conversely the lack of it exposes the unwary to numerous pitfalls. The danger will perhaps be better appreciated by citing one or two examples. For instance, there is not the slightest scientific foundation for the hypothesis that the prototype of the legendary Polyphemus was a gorilla, a creature which first became known to the ancient world through the *Periplus of Hanno*;¹ nor for the equally absurd identification of Scylla with a gigantic octopus, far exceeding in size the solitary Mediterranean species;² nor for the alleged anticipation of the Darwinian theory of evolution by an Aphrodite cultus at Mycenae;³ nor for the fanciful conjecture put forward in all seriousness that the Indian creature made known by Ctesias "with powerful tusks above four feet long"—whence its subsequent appellation *odontotyrannus*—was in reality the mammoth;⁴ nor that the "bird" *δίκαυρον* (in point of fact none other than the Scarabaeoid dung-beetle), whose ejections are said to have produced painless death like sleep, is merely an allegorical paraphrase for opium;⁵ nor for the alleged commensal habits of the crocodile and trochilus, or spur-winged plover.⁶

Amongst other things it will be seen from the few instances we have taken at hazard that Euhemerism is responsible for some very curious deductions in the domain of ancient animal nomenclature. On the other hand, the judicious employment of this principle is often productive of gratifying results, as witness the following illustrations.

¹ Zell, Bursian's Jahresb. (1901), 117, p. 11. There is some doubt whether the 'gorilla' (onomat.) brought back by the famous Carthaginian navigator of the fifth century before our era was the same anthropoid to which the name is now applied. By many the meagre description is thought to refer to the chimpanzee. A connection between the cyclopean legend and Sicilian bone-caverns has been suggested by D'Archiac (*Revue Scient.*, 1863, 1, p. 395).

² Tümpel, *Der mykenische Polyp und die Hydra*. Festschr. f. J. Overbeck, 1893, p. 144 ff. Also in *Philol.* (1894), 53, p. 551. H. Steuding, *Skylla, ein Krake am Vorgebirge Skyllaion*, *Neue Jahrb. f. Phil. u. Päd.*, 1895, 151, p. 185.

³ F. Houssay, *Les théories de la genèse à Mycènes et le sens zoologique de certains symboles du culte d'Aphrodite*, *Revue archéol.*, 1895, pp. 1-27. H. Coupin, *Le poulpe et la croix gammée*, *La Nature*, May 20, 1905, p. 396.

⁴ J. F. Brandt, in *Bull. Acad. Imp. Sci. St. Pétersb.* (1861), 3, p. 335. Graefe, in *Mém. ibid.* (sec. sci., polit., etc., 1832), 1, p. 69. Olfers, *Abhandl. Akad. Wiss. Berlin f. 1839* (1842), p. 62.

⁵ Ch. Lassen, *Indische Altertumskunde*, 2d ed., 1874, 2, p. 652.

⁶ There are not wanting modern editors who repose confidence in this time-worn observation myth which has been handed down to us from the father of history (Herod. 2, 68).

First, to note a popular fallacy, widespread in point of space and time, and having to do with remains of fossil animals. Readers are familiar with the veneration in which the bones of "giants" and legendary heroes were held throughout classical antiquity. Leaving out of account the more primitive gigantomachia,¹ there are a number of passages in ancient authors describing occurrences which are paralleled in patristic and secular chronicles of later times, especially those recording the translation of bones of saints. Some of them, furthermore, find their analogue in the comparatively modern refflorescence of the Teutobochus myth. One has only to recall the very circumstantial account given by Herodotus (I, 67 ff.), Plato (de Rep. 2, 3), Pausanias (I, 35; 8, 29), Philostratus (Heroicus, I) and others of the discovery of the remains of Homeric chieftains and divers local heroes, reports which tally at all points with the exhumation of fossil vertebrate remains. There is often internal evidence, apart from the huge size of the members, to show that these could not possibly relate to human skeletons. Besides, even in antiquity there were not wanting thoughtful persons who scouted the popular interpretation of these relics. Suffice it to note that Suetonius, Hadrian's astute secretary, shrewdly observes that "the bones of huge beasts or sea-monsters both have and still do pass current for the bones of giants."²

Now this rationalistic, or if one will, Euhemeristic interpretation of the passages³ in question which relate to the "graves of giants" has pointed the way to practical results of far-reaching importance. Taking his cue from the ever-helpful Pausanias, who mentions the finding of huge bones in the plain near Megalopolis, Dr. Theodore Skouphos⁴ of the University of Athens, organized a systematic search for skeletal remains in the vicinity indicated, and was rewarded by the discovery of a new and extremely rich fossiliferous locality, rivaling the famous bone-bed of Pikermi, on the road between Marathon and Athens.⁵

¹ Cf. Max Mayer, *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst* (Berlin, 1887). See also Cuvier's *Hist. des sci. nat.*, etc.

² Cited by Charles Blount, in his curious annotations on Philostratus, 1680 (concerning the Life of Apollonius Tyaneus), a work which was ineffectually suppressed for political reasons.

³ The loci critici are commented upon in the following able articles: E. von Lasaulx, *Die Geologie der Griechen und Römer. Abhandl. bayer. Akad. Wiss., phil.-hist. Cl.* (1853), 6, p. 577. M. Hoernes, *Einige Notizen alter Classiker über Auffindung vorweltlicher Thierreste (sog. Riesenknochen)*. *Denkschr. Akad. Wiss. Wien* (1880), 40, p. 308. J. Schvarcz, *The Failure of Geological Attempts made by the Greeks* (London, 1862-68).

⁴ Skouphos, *Ueber die paläontologischen Ausgrabungen in Griechenland in Beziehung auf das Vorhandensein des Menschen*. *C. R. Cong. Internat. Archéol., 1ère session* (Athens, 1905). Remains of the elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, mastodon, hyaena, boar, and various ruminants have been brought to light in great profusion as a result of this fortunate discovery.

⁵ First exploited by A. Wagner of Munich, and described in detail by the late Professor Albert Gaudry in his *Animaux fossiles et géologie de l'Attique* (Paris, 1862-67).

For a second illustration, let us take the case of the problematical 'odontotyrannus' of the Alexander saga, whose characters are derived with some curious modifications from the unnamed "amphibian" of Palladius, or the σκώληξ of Ctesias and Aelian; "bestia maior elephante, tribus armata in fronte cornibus: quam Indi appellant *odontotyrannum*, capitis equini, coloris atrii". (Vincent de Beauvais, *Speculum hist.*, 4, 54). All sorts of guesses have been made as to the meaning of this word. One author, as we have seen, gravely asserts it to have been the mammoth, whose survival into historical times thus becomes a necessary postulate. Various others have claimed it to be the crocodile, boa constrictor,¹ Platanistid of the Ganges, elephant and rhinoceros; and the lexicons usually render the appellation "vermes."

The latest and most successful attempt at a solution of the problem is that of Curt Müller,² undertaken at the instigation of Professor Joseph Partsch, who has so greatly augmented our knowledge of the physical geography of Greece. Ctesias is unquestionably the ultimate source of the widely varying versions in regard to this remarkable creature, as he was also the first to introduce the knowledge of the elephant and other oriental wonders—to say nothing of the fabulous unicorn—to the western world. But just as the origin of the μονόκερως has been traced by Schrader³ and others to ornamental designs painted on the walls of the Persian court at Persepolis, so too the odontotyrannus is susceptible of a somewhat similar interpretation, the description of it possibly harking back to Indian textile designs. In different ways it has been possible to reconcile other apparently incredible statements of Ctesias—as for instance, that relating to a tribe of swarthy-hued Indians who subsist exclusively on lacteal diet and have no evacuations—with the reports of modern travellers.⁴ Wherefore, as Lassen remarks, "the accusations of mendacity heaped upon the Greek physician by the ancients have been generally withdrawn."⁵

An ornithologic name of analogous formation to the last is pterygotyrannus, found among the Indian glosses in the Lexicon of Hesychius (L. H. Gray and M. Schuyler, *Indian Glosses in Hesychios*. Amer. Journ. Phil. 22, p. 199). This has been variously interpreted as a pheasant, parrot and peacock, with the chances in favor of the first-named (*Phasianus argus*). The word itself is interesting for recalling certain vernacular epithets

¹ Lassen, who proposes this conjecture, is happily oblivious of the fact that this reptile is peculiar to South America.

² Müller, *Studien zur Geschichte der Erdkunde im Altertum*. Inaug. Diss., Breslau, 1902.

³ Schrader, *Ueber Monoceros*, etc. *Sitzungsber. preuss. Akad. Wiss.*, 1892, 2, p. 573.

⁴ Capt. F. Wilford, in *Asiatic Researches*, 1809, 9, p. 69.

⁵ Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumskunde*, 2d ed., 1874, p. 641.

of domestic animals, as developed in the large cities of the Graeco-Roman empire. Among slang expressions of this sort, as Professor Sophocles has pointed out, are *περεινός*, *cock*, literally the winged one; *ἄλογον*, *horse*, literally the irrational animal.¹

Yet another example of keen philological analysis is furnished by the application of the Euhemeristic principle to the myth of the gold-digging ants. On this point we will content ourselves with quoting the following paragraph from an article by the director of the Dublin Museum of Science and Art, Professor Valentine Ball:²

"The so-called myth of the gold-digging ants was not cleared up till, by chance, information was received as to the customs and habits of the Thibetan gold miners of the present day. Then Sir H. Rawlinson, and independently, Dr. Schiern, of Copenhagen, were enabled to come forward and state beyond a question of a doubt that the *myrmeces* of Herodotus and Megasthenes were Thibetan miners, and, it may be added, their dogs. The same dogs are now for the first time identified, as will be seen further on, with the griffins. . . . I will mention also that the horn of the gold-digging ant, which we are told by Pliny was preserved in the temple of Hercules at Erythrae, and which for centuries has been the subject of much speculation, was probably merely one of the gold-miners' pickaxes. I have been informed by an eyewitness, Mr. R. Lydekker, that the picks in use by agriculturists and miners in India consist of horns of wild sheep mounted on handles."

It may be instructive perhaps to cite still one more instance where an apparently insoluble nature-myth has been shown by means of comparison and correlation with known facts to contain a substantial nucleus of truth. Throughout mediaeval and ancient literature are found abundant allusions to the spontaneous generation of insects, chiefly bees and wasps, from decaying animal carcasses. This belief was extremely widespread, and not infrequently invested with symbolical significance, in so far as corruption may have been thought to be put off for incorruption. Even among Arabian chronicles of the first millennium of our era we meet with passages like the following, which is extracted from

¹ Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci., 1860, 4, p. 409. One should be on one's guard against accepting with too great literalness an author's assignment of characteristics to particular animals, since experience shows that in ancient, precisely as in modern times, these are sometimes arbitrarily transposed from one creature to another. Thus, when the Romans first encountered the elephant in the army of Pyrrhus in Lucania, they gave it the name of the "Lucanian ox", as Lucretius says (*de Rer. Nat.* v. 1301):

Inde boves lucas turrato corpore, tetras,
Anguimanus, belli docuerunt volnera Poeni
Sufferre, et magnas Martis turbare catervas.

To mention only one modern instance, readers of Voltaire will recall how in *Zadig* various qualities are attributed to the basilisk which conventionally belong to other fabulous creatures.

² Proc. Roy. Irish Acad., 2d ser., 1885, 2, p. 303.

Albiruni's Chronology of Ancient Nations (Sachu's ed., 1879, p. 214):

"The formation of scorpions out of figs and mountain balm, that of bees from the flesh of oxen, that of wasps from the flesh of horses, is well known to all naturalists. . . For worms are produced out of flesh, and in flesh lice and other animals are living."

For a simple and convincing explanation of this observation-myth, scholars are indebted to the late Baron Osten-Sacken, of Heidelberg, who identifies the "Bugonia" of ancient fable with the mimetic fly *Eristalis tenax*, and the supposed "wasps" emanating from putrescent horse carrion with another Dipterid insect, *Helophilus*. The Baron's interesting essay On the Bugonia of the Ancients is now readily accessible, having been reprinted from an Italian entomological journal in English dress, to which are added some supplementary comments. (Heidelberg, 1893-5).

Turning now to our collateral topic, we may note some of the attempts that have been made toward elucidation of the graphic or plastic representations of forms of animal life that have come down to us from olden times. In this category are included engraved portraits, whether on gems, coins, metal-work or the monuments; statuary, in the round or relief, and of the materials usual in the plastic arts; and lastly the protean assemblage of vase and mural paintings that yield such a rich mine of information. The subjects depicted in Pompeian wall frescoes have been exhaustively treated in well-known monographs, and separate indices have been published of animal and floral representations. So too, have the animal designs engraved on island gems¹ and coins received special attention at the hands of competent students. The minor art productions which have been perhaps least investigated from a strictly zoological point of view are statuettes,² ceramic paintings and inscriptions.

Regarding the last-named, it is interesting to recall that Egyptian animal inscriptions were first studied by Champollion and Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire during and following Napoleon's ill-fated expedition; and, after nearly a century of neglect, there is evidence of a revival of interest in this direction. Very important for the naturalist, from their bearing on former geographical distribution and variation of animal species during the lapse of a score of centuries—however imperceptible that may appear to be—are the recent studies of Lartet and Gaillard on the mummified animals of Egypt.³ We may refer also to a brief article by Dr. R. Lydekker of the British Museum, entitled Some

¹ Cf. Imhoff-Keller. Tier u. Pflanzenbilder auf Münzen u. Gemmen, etc.

² Blumenbach, J. F., Specimen historiae naturalis antiquae artis operibus illustratae eaque vicissim illustrantis. Got., 1808. Remarkable for being an early portrayal of the rare two-horned rhinoceros.

³ Arch. Mus. d'Hist. Nat. de Lyon, 1903, 7, No. 2.

Ancient Animal Portraits, which was contributed to *Nature* for 1904, and presents the following pertinent comments (p. 207):

"Very little attention appears to have been hitherto directed to the correct identification of wild animals represented in the ancient Assyrian and Babylonian sculptures, and in the frescoes of Egypt under the Pharaohs. Antiquarians and Egyptologists seem in the main to have contented themselves with calling an animal a gazelle, an antelope or a deer, without the slightest attempt to ascertain whether such titles are correctly bestowed, and in some cases utterly oblivious of the fact that deer (with the exception of the Barbary red deer and the fallow-deer in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco) are quite unknown in the African continent."

Although it is true that comparatively little has been done in investigating Asiatic animal inscriptions, nevertheless a laudable beginning was made in the last quarter of the preceding century by W. Houghton in his essay *On the Mammalia of the Assyrian Sculptures*.¹ In this the author frankly acknowledges his indebtedness for numerous hints to Delitzsch's work on Assyrian Animal Names, indispensable to all students of the monuments. More recently O. Schrader has contributed a suggestive article on certain profile figures represented in oriental art designs, from which may be traced *inter alia* the conventional idea of fabulous creatures like the unicorn and the chimaera.² Properly to appreciate these and similar results is to recognize, and, should it lie within one's power, to respond to an incentive for further progress.

C. R. EASTMAN.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

The Acropolis of Athens. By MARTIN L. D'OUGE. 8vo. The Macmillan Co., 1908. Pp. XX+405.

This handsome gilt-edged volume, published as a companion to Seymour's *Life in the Homeric Age*, is profusely and beautifully illustrated with nine photogravures, seven plans (one colored), and 134 cuts in the text. In view of the many works which have appeared on Athens as a whole, it is instructive to have one which is limited to the Acropolis. Yet so much of the history and culture of Athens centered about the Acropolis that its history is really the history of Athens and we have in the present work almost as large a volume as Gardner's *Ancient Athens*, to which it is similar in make-up and from which many illustrations are taken. The

¹ Houghton, *Trans. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1877, 5, p. 33; pt. 2, p. 319.

² See too, in *La Nature* for April 17, 1909. Prof. E. Trouessart's article entitled *La licorne chez les anciens et les modernes*, and one by O. Théatis in a recent number of *Le Musée*, on the Lion in Ancient Art. In this last the lion is shown to be one of the most frequently represented animals in ancient art, the oldest example cited being an ivory statuette found at Abydos.

arrangement is in the main historical though an analysis shows that neither the strictly chronological nor strictly topographical order is followed. Chapter I discusses the Acropolis, its Natural Features and Original Occupation as Sanctuary, Citadel, and Residence; chapter II considers the Earliest Historic Period down to the Persian Destruction, the Pelargicon, the Beulé Gate, the Roman Stairway, the Old Temple of Athena, Remains of Sculpture; chapter III covers the period from the Persian Destruction to the Age of Pericles, taking up the subject of the Walls, the Propylon, the Older Parthenon, Foundations below the Periclean Parthenon, Curvature of the Lines of the Parthenon, Remains of Sculpture; chapter IV treats of the Age of Pericles, the Parthenon, the Propylaea and Temple of Wingless Victory, and the Erechtheum; chapter V examines the Temples and Shrines on the Southern Slope of the Acropolis and the Theatre of Dionysus; chapter VI deals with the Acropolis in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods and the Descriptive Tour of Pausanias on the Acropolis; chapter VII gives an account of the Acropolis from the close of the Roman Period to the Present and of Modern Investigations and Restorations. Pages 332-342 give 228 valuable notes and references which present other views than those of the author, supplement the text, and bring it up to date. There are three appendices and a good index. The first appendix gives (A) the original sources and (B) Frazer's translation of Pausanias' Description of the Acropolis and (C) a select bibliography. The second is an English abstract of Professor White's article on the Pelargicon which appeared in modern Greek garb in *'Εφ. Ἀρχ.* 1894. The third discusses the problem of the Old Athena Temple and the Hecatompodon.

Professor D'Ooge was director of the American School in Athens in 1886-7 and was present during the excavations on the Acropolis. He has made repeated visits to Athens since and this book is the fruit of his life work and especially of his personal study of the site and its ruins. He has not merely given us an excellent and convenient summary of the most important contributions to the history of the Acropolis but has expressed sound independent judgment on the opinions of others and has taken unto account with few exceptions the most recent investigations. Dörpfeld's new theory that the older Parthenon is Pre-Persian is adopted and his reconstruction of the original plan of the Erechtheum is accepted. Stevens' discovery of windows in the east wall of the Erechtheum is noted and his reconstruction given, p. 330, fig. 134. The recent restoration of the west wall and north porch may also be seen, p. 199, fig. 90.

Professor D'Ooge follows Dörpfeld in most of his views but differs from him especially with regard to the Old Temple of Athena and the Pelargicon. He believes that the Pelargicon and the fortifications of the Acropolis did not remain till the time of Herodes Atticus but (p. 30) that the Pelargicon was destroyed

by the Persians, never to be restored. This seems hardly consistent with the view expressed, pp. 16 and 28, that the Acropolis continued a citadel until the Age of Pericles and then ceased to be such. It perhaps is an exaggeration to say (p. 30) that Professor White has refuted Dörpfeld and (p. 29) to call his theory extraordinary. Is not rather Professor D'Ooge's theory extraordinary that from the Mycenaean epoch till the Age of Pericles and in late times the Acropolis was fortified but that in the height of its glory, when Sparta and others were waiting for a chance to attack it, Pericles left it unprotected? The operations of 403 B. C. and 86 B. C. as well as those of 480 and 479 B. C. indicate some sort of fortification. The towers and walls of the Beulé Gate, too ugly for ornaments, certainly seem to show (p. 33 notwithstanding) that the Acropolis was fortified from the first century and I feel that the view that it was always a citadel as well as a place of beautiful buildings has not been finally disproved. Nor can I bring myself to the certain conclusion that Dörpfeld is wrong with regard to the Old Athena Temple, though Professor D'Ooge presents the different views with great clearness and his arguments carry weight. His own theory (p. 49) is that "after the Persian invasion the old double temple of Athena and Erechtheus and the old Hecatompædon were provisionally repaired until they were superseded by the Parthenon and Erechtheum". Why should the Hecatompædon be repaired instead of the older Parthenon, which also was burned by the Persians? If, as Professor D'Ooge thinks, the Old Athena Temple was repaired, as well as the Pelargicon, it could have stood only a few years. He seems to think Pericles instituted an era of destruction as well as of construction, destroying the Old Athena Temple, an older Erechtheum, and the Pelargicon,—a theory for which there is no more evidence than for the continuance of these structures when once repaired. Gardner and others are followed (p. 67) in the belief that the lower town of Athens had a wall before the Persian attack. Some scholars, however, still dispute this in view of the facts that there are no remains of a city-wall before Themistocles (and his was a wall of sun-dried bricks) and that the march to Marathon and the taking to ships before the battle of Salamis may best be explained on the theory that Athens had no walls to protect her citizens and so took the offensive instead of defensive. These, however, are matters of opinion and it must be said that Professor D'Ooge is very sane in his views. His work is so well done that the first edition doubtless will be quickly exhausted and possibly I may be pardoned for making a few suggestions out of several which occur to me for a second edition.

In the first place one or two general criticisms. The most recent editions are not always cited. For example, p. 340, note 183 the reference is to Hicks, *Greek Historical Inscriptions* no. 36 instead of to the later and better edition of Hicks and Hill,

(1901), no. 55 and p. 356 to Luckenbach, *Die Akropolis* (1896) rather than to the far superior edition of 1905. Likewise it would be much better, p. 332, note 16 to cite Wiegand, *Die Archaische Poros-Architektur* than J. H. S. XVI, 338 and, note 18, to cite Winter, *Die Typen der figürlichen Terrakotten* rather than a mere report in *Arch. Anz.*, 1893, p. 140. P. 355 Hitzig-Blümner, *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio*, 2 vols. is mentioned with its German title but there are now four volumes. In the bibliography several titles are lacking; the list, however, is selective and on the whole excellent. It should nevertheless include at least the works of Lechat (especially his *Au Musée de l'Acropole d'Athènes*), Gräber's article on the *Enneacrunus Ath. Mitt.* XXX, p. 1 f., Lermann's *Alt-Griechische Plastik* (important for the study of the polychromy of the sculptures of the Acropolis) but above all Kavvadias und Kawerau, *Die Ausgrabung der Akropolis 1885-1890*, and Furtwängler's articles in the *Sitzb. d. Bayr. Akad. d. Wiss.* 1905 and 1907. For the *Corpus of Greek Inscriptions* we still have the abbreviation C. I. A. instead of I. G. The use of the phrase "recent excavations" (pp. 16, 95, 296 *et passim*) for excavations of nearly a quarter of a century ago seems strange in an ever-changing and progressive subject like archaeology. But such minute defects do not impair the book's essential value, which is certainly great. The long and hard labor of over twenty years which Professor D'Ooge has put into his task of love has found fruition in a most noble volume.

Architectural terms are sometimes used loosely and not always with their exact archaeological and technical meaning. The word *stylobate* in a strictly architectural sense applies only to the upper step of the *crepidoma* (a word not used by Professor D'Ooge) whereas it is applied here to the whole *crepidoma* (cf. pp. 89, 114, 197, etc.) and we hear often of the "top step of the *stylobate*". P. 124, *mutules* are not square but always rectangular. P. 126, from the third sentence one might get the idea that "the golden or bronze jars or tripods" were not also *acroteria*. An *acroterion* is not merely an *anthemion* nor is it limited to the ornament on the apex of a gable. P. 128 (so also p. 160), the technical word *taenia* should be used instead of "moulding". Strictly speaking one limits the word *taenia* to the moulding above the *architrave* and it should not be applied to the band above the frieze as is done, p. 130, where we have the spelling *tenia*. *Triglyph* or *triglyphos* is a better word than *triglyphon* (pp. 129, 169). We cannot speak of the lowest course of a wall as "the so-called *orthostas*" (p. 197). Moreover the plural *orthostatai* is preferable to the singular which must be *orthostates*. P. 218, most archaeologists prefer Attic-Ionic to Ionic-Attic style.

P. v, it is not strictly accurate to say that "the excavations upon the summit and the slopes of the Acropolis of Athens were completed in 1889" because many excavations have been made on the west and especially on the north slope since that time (cf.

'Εφ. 'Αρχ. 1897, p. 1 f., Miss Harrison, *Primitive Athens*, p. 89 f.), to say nothing of some work on the summit itself. P. 14, Mycenae is said to be the only ancient Greek city whose original plan we know with some degree of definiteness. Surely we know that of Gournia as well, to say nothing of Palaikastro, Phylakopi, and many later Greek cities. Pages 53-63 are already antiquated by Furtwängler's criticism of Wiegand's reconstruction of the *poros* pediments of the Hecatompodon (cf. Sitzb. d. k. Bayr. Akad., p. 1905, p. 433 f.), and especially by the work of Petersen and Heberdey (cf. Petersen, *Die Burg-tempel der Athenaia*, pp. 21-40; *Hellenic Herald* II, 1908, June, p. 121). Nor does Professor D'Ooge seem to know of Furtwängler's reconstruction (cf. op. cit., p. 458 f.) of the marble group representing the gigantomachia, from the pediment of the Old Athena Temple. Nor is any attention paid to Furtwängler's sound criticism of Schrader's theory with regard to the so-called "wagenbesteigende Frau" (p. 62) and the archaic relief of Hermes (p. 104) that they belong to the frieze of the Old Athena Temple. In Sitzb. d. k. Bayr. Akad., 1907, 1 f. Furtwängler argues that these reliefs come rather from an altar. P. 64, it is not certain that the marble group of Harmodius and Aristogeiton in Naples is a copy of the work by Antenor. Some think this is a copy of the group by Critius and Nesiotes. P. 73, fig. 24 is taken from Weller's article on the Pre-Periclean Propylon in *Am. J. Arch.* VIII, 1904, p. 35 f. and not from Jahn-Michaelis, *Arx Athenarum* (1901), as is stated, p. xiii. P. 74, for Hermes Propylaea read Propylaeus. P. 101, fig. 40, we should have included in the reproduction of the Moscophorus the inscribed base and the right foot. Nor is this "the best preserved male figure that has come down to us from the time antedating the Persian war" (p. 102). The so-called Apollos of Tenea, Melos, Keratea, Sunium, etc., are better preserved, to say nothing of the marble figures of the giants from the Hecatompodon, if the statement be limited to the Acropolis. On pages 103 f. some of the sentences and references have in some way become confused. The sentence at the end of the first paragraph, p. 103 ("The type of this rider", etc.), is out of place. Moreover the description, p. 103, applies not to fig. 41 but to fig. 46, p. 107, and *vice versa*, p. 107, we have a description not of fig. 46, a marble head, but of fig. 41, p. 103, a bronze head. P. 110 says "One might say of Pericles that he transformed the Acropolis from a fortress built of lime-stone to a sanctuary of worship whose shrines and temples were constructed of white marble". But long before Pericles plenty of marble was used in the Older Parthenon, the Old Temple of Athena, and the Earlier Propylon, this last being built almost entirely of marble, to say nothing of the numberless marble statues and inscriptions. The statement would apply nearly as well to Peisistratus or Cleisthenes as to Pericles. On the same page we hear that the chief architect of the Parthenon was "Ictinus who had already

distinguished himself by the building of the great temples of Demeter at Eleusis and of Apollo at Bassae". But probably the Periclean Telesterion, and certainly the temple at Bassae, is later than the Parthenon (cf. Frazer, Pausanias IV, p. 404). P. 143f., it would be well to mention the admirable copy of the Athena Parthenos in Patras, cf. B. S. A., 1896-7, p. 121 f. P. 183, the northeast hall of the Propylaea is said to have a row of nine Doric columns whereas Wood has shown there were only eight (cf. J. H. S. XXVIII, p. 331). Pp. 183, 184 on the subject of the roof of the Propylaea we must not be content with accepting, as we are advised to do, the conclusions of Penrose, Bohn, and Dörpfeld, for Wood and Dinsmoor are proving that their work is not acceptable. The roofs were hip-roofs, not gables. P. 189, it should be stated that there are two decrees relating to the Nike temple, one somewhat later than the other. Pp. 196, 197, it is difficult to believe with Professor D'Ooge that the Erechtheum within a year or two after its completion was called "the ancient temple of Athena", especially since it was a temple of Erechtheus or Poseidon as well as of Athena. Pp. 207, 211, it is thought that the paintings of the Butadae were on the walls of the middle room but they were more probably (cf. note 139) in the east room and this would explain the purpose of the windows discovered by Stevens just as it does in the *Pinakotheke* of the Propylaea. Nor do I think the word "double" in Pausanias refers to a double story but rather to the double temple of Erechtheus and Athena. P. 216, it is said of fig. 99 that "the head and tail of the serpent appear above the chest" containing Erichthonius. But these are the heads of two serpents, not the head and tail of one, cf. Wiegand, *Die Archaische Poros-Architektur*, p. 96. Pp. 217, 218, we might explain the Caryatid Porch as the grave-monument of Cecrops. P. 235 f., the views of Dörpfeld and Puchstein with regard to the Greek stage in general and with regard to that in the theatre of Dionysus at Athens are well summarized, but a recent article by Petersen in *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* XXIII, p. 33 f. thinks the proscenium of stone is not Hellenistic but a part of the Lycurgan building, and that the supposed row of columns along the front of the *scene* wall never existed. Nor is there any reference to Petersen's account of the Nike bastion in l. c., p. 12 f. P. 287 and note 186 there should be a reference for Artemis Brauronia to Pickard, *Am. J. Arch.*, 1898, p. 367 f. P. 288, mention should be made at least of the copies of the group of Marsyas and Athena which stood on the Acropolis (Paus. I, 24, 1), and of Sauer's reconstruction in *Jahrb. Arch. Inst.* XXIII, p. 125 f., of which there was a preliminary publication in *Woch. f. kl. Phil.*, 1907, col. 1243 f. In fact the account of the sculptures of the Acropolis is incomplete and there is no account at all of the important vase-finds. P. 340, note 190, "he is of the opinion, etc.", Professor D'Ooge seems not to have made the acquaintance of Miss C. A. Hutton.

The reading of the proof has been unusually good, but cf. pp. 82, 83, VI for VII three times, p. 113 of for cf., p. 133 to observed for to be observed, p. 162 diphoroi for diphrophoroi, p. 337, note 114, Kapitā for Kapital, p. 339, note 167, Hyppolyteum for Hippolyteum.

As has been said above, criticisms upon this work of Professor D'Ooge are obliged to confine themselves to minutiae; for that is practically the limit of their field. These delightfully written and scholarly pages not only retire Bötticher's treatise as an up-to-date investigation of the problems of the Acropolis but constitute a most helpful handbook to the tourist in Athens as well as a standard work for the archaeological specialist.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

REPORTS.

ARCHIV FÜR LATEINISCHE LEXIKOGRAPHIE UND GRAMMATIK. VOL. XII. Second Half.

299-300. F. Vollmer, A request for lexical material from monographs and notes in periodicals, with a suggestion as to a convenient form for sending these.

301-308. E. Wölfflin, Analogiebildungen auf -ellus, -ella, -ellum. By the addition of the dimin, suffix -lo to noun stems we get through syncope and assimilation forms in -allus, -ellus, -illus, -ollus and -ullus, such as grallae (= grad'lae), libellus (= liber'lus), etc. Of these the forms in -allus and -ollus are least frequent, while those in -illus and -ellus are most common. Such forms as tantillus, novellus, etc., are not double or three-fold diminutives, but the use of -ellus and -illus was extended by analogy, and displaced -ulus. This tendency was increased by the mistaken idea that -ellus in misellus (= miser'lus), etc., was a suffix; cf. -anus in Romanus. Villa (vic-la) may be connected with vicus, in spite of the difference in gender and the rarity of ll from cl, neither of which is unexampled.

309-331. G. Helmreich, Zu Caelius Aurelianus Acutarum passionum libri III. A continuation of the investigation begun on pp. 173-186. The conclusion is, that anyone who uses this writer for grammatical and lexical studies cannot rely on Amman's text, but must make use also of the editio princeps.

331. Eb. Nestle, Animaequitardare. This word, which is omitted from the Thes. Ling. Lat., is read in Eccl. 29. 8 (11) = Corp. Scr. Eccl. Lat. 12. 407. 7. Additional examples of the noun animaequitas and the adj. animaequus are also given.

332. E. Wölfflin, Lucania. The earliest instance of this word appears to be in Hor. Serm. 2. 1. 38. Previously Lucana (sc. terra) or Lucani was used, and the latter should be read, rather than Lucania, in Cic., Tusc. Disp. 1. 89.

333-344. E. Wölfflin, Epitome. Although this word is of Greek origin, it does not seem to be used as a title in Grecian literature. Among the Romans M. Junius Brutus, the murderer of Caesar, published an epitome of Polybius, Caelius Antipater and Fannius. Somewhat later Varro made an epitome of his De Ling. Lat., reducing the original 25 books to 9, as well as of the Imagines and the Antiquitates. About the year 30 A. D. an epitome of Livy was in existence, which in common with the

periochae of the same writer contained also matter drawn from other sources. From the time of Hadrian even the epitomes themselves were abridged, as for example Festus by Paulus. The difference between a periocha and an epitome is, that the former is a mere summary, a sort of table of contents, while the latter furnishes a readable text. The pure Latin word for an epitome, according to Seneca (Epist. 39. 1) was in his time *breviarium*, in earlier times (*olim*) *summarius*. The former term was also used of a brief history, not an abridgment of a more extensive work, but based on various sources. Other synonyms of *breviarium* are *brevis* (sc. *liber*), *breve*, *abbreviatio*, and *compendium*. In general we find that the Romans, even in epitomizing, were in the habit of adding matter from other sources, a fact which is unfavorable to the view that Roman writers of history depended on a single source.

345-354. E. Wölfflin, *Plinius und Cluvius Rufus*. The parallelism between Tac. Hist. i. 81 *cum timeret Otho, timebatur* and Plut., Otho 3 *φοβούμενος . . . ἤν φοβερός* is so close as to make it evident either that Plutarch made use of the Histories of Tacitus, or that both drew on a common source. Of those who hold the latter view, some regard the source as Pliny the elder, others as Cluvius Rufus. Wölfflin believes that Plutarch took the expression directly from Tacitus, both because Tacitus was a diligent reader of Seneca, in whose works such antithetical expressions are common, and on account of the parallelism of *quod timent an quod timentur*, in Tac. Dial. 13.

354. E. Wölfflin, *Titulus Mummianus*. Would arrange this in four lines and read the last two as follows:

Ob hasce res bene gestas quod in bello voverat
Hanc dedicat aedem et signu Herculis Victoris.

355-365. Meader-Wölfflin, *Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa III*. A continuation of the review on pp. 239 ff.

365. A. Zimmermann, *Zur lateinischen Wortbildung*. Since *opter* = *propter* is found in Corp. Gloss. IV. 265. 15, *opter quod* in C. I. L. VI. 14672 should not be changed to *propter quod*. *Albarus*, = *λευκός*, Corp. Gloss. III. 264. 33 is related to *albus* as *Oscan casnar* is to *cānus*. The same suffix *-ar* appears in *Caesar*, *Firmarus*, *Aesar*, and *Longarenus*. The name *Stolus* in C. I. L. VI. 4925 shows the existence of an adjective *stolus*, related to *stultus* as *Sancus* is to *sanctus*. *Indolis*, = *ἐπίπονος*, Corp. Gloss. II. 80. 54 confirms the derivation of *sedulus* from *dolus*. *Indolis* is formed like *inanimis* and *sedulus* like *securus*. *Commoram* = *cōram* (*co-ōram*), Corp. Gloss. V. 14. 30 and 56. 12. Suggests the meaning *contra oram*. *Tellor* = *homo*, Corp. Gloss. ii. 595. 16. May be related to *tellus* as *decor* is to *decus*. *Necessis*. Derived from *ne* and *cessis*, verbal substantive from *cedere*; cf. *messis* and the adverb *cessim*.

366. E. Wölfflin, *Agnellus, agellus*. *Agnellus* is an example of the extension of the suffix *-ellus*: see pp. 301 ff. above. *Agnulus* would have become *ag(e)n-lus*, *agellus*, and would have been a homonym of *agellus* from *ag(e)r-lus*.

366. E. Wölfflin, *Salsamentarius*. Horace's father is said in the *Suetonius vita* to have been a *salsamentarius*. The word means a dealer in salt fish and salted meats.

367-372. R. Planta, *Die Bildung aus -ēnus*. Would derive words in *-ēnus* from a primitive Italic *-einos*, a by-form of *-īnos*, contrary to the view of Skutsch. He makes an exception, of course, of those words in which *-ēnos* represents an original *-esnos*, among which he would not include *egēnus*. Also to be excluded are the words in which the actual suffix is *-no*, such as *habe-na*, and analogical forms, such as *terrenus* beside *aenus*. The interesting suggestion is made that the abnormal gentile name *Verres* came from an original *Verrenus*.

373-400. E. Wölfflin, *Moderne Lexikographie*. An interesting and suggestive article, a summary of a paper presented to the *Bayerische Acad.* in 1894. The necessity of taking into consideration the historical and geographical points of view, as well as the style of individual writers, and the branches of literature which they represent, is dwelt on. The causes of the death of words and the substitution of new terms are discussed, and the recovery of lost words from existing Latin derivatives and from the Romance languages.

400. J. E. B. Mayor, *Besta : similitudinariae : infrugifer : anxio*. Cites instances of all of these words, the existence of which was denied by Weissner on p. 284.

401-410. E. Lommatzsch, *Zur Mulomedicina Chironis*. An examination of the language and style of this work, based on the edition of Oder, Leipzig, 1901. The judgment of Vegetius, *eloquentiae inopia ac sermonis vilitate sordescunt*, is confirmed, and it is shown that V. in his use of the work attempted to free it from vulgarisms of syntax and style.

411-425. Miscellen. G. Gundermann, *Bruta*. The gloss *Heronalacah brutae diversarum* should be read ἡρώων ἀλοχοὶ *brutae diversorum*, *brutae* being a Germanic borrowed word = *Braut*, and *diversorum*, the translation of the Greek *διαφόρων*; cf. Hesychius, ἡρώες· οἱ διαφέροντες ἀρετῇ.

G. Gundermann, *Oruia*. This word is a Latinized form of *ὄρυα*, the vulgar word for the classical *χορδή*, "sausage."

G. Gundermann, *Glos. Gluttit. Gluma*. A reconstruction of the glosses on these words in *Corp. Gloss. II. 24. 29-32*, where they are confused.

J. M. Stowasser, *Die sogenannte Interjektion EN*. Three varieties of *en* must be distinguished, interrogative, hortative, and

deictic. These are of different origin, the first being for *estne*, "is it possible?"; the second from *in* = *isne*, *eisne*, corresponding to the use of *age* with imperatives; the last a Sandhi-form for *em* (= *eme*). *Enim* und *Nempe*. *Enim* is only used affirmatively, and is the imperative of *immo*. *Nempe* is of Umbrian origin, introduced into Latin by the Umbrian Plautus. It is formed of *enem* and *-pe* (= Lat. *-que*), and lost the first syllable by *procopie* (cf. *stud* for *istud*, etc.), of which it is perhaps the earliest example.

E. Wölfflin, *Das Suffix -aster*. This suffix, derived from *ad* and *-tro*, implies nearness or similarity to, and is not always "pejorative" in its meaning; the *surdaster*, for example is only *subsurdus*, and hence better off than the *surdus*. It is doubtful whether any suffix is strictly speaking "pejorative."

E. Wölfflin, *Propitius, Komparativ propior*. In Quint. 10. 1. 91 would take *propius* as comparative of *propitius*; cf. *ferus*, *ferocior*, *fidus*, *fideliior*. *Propius* seems to have the same force in Verg., *Aen.* 1. 526, and perhaps in Mart. 1. 70. 16.

K. Brugmann, *Salūs*. The *ū* in this word is original and not from a diphthong. It is a primary abstract in *-ti*, like *dos*, *mens*, *ars*, etc.

F. Vogel, *Ipse etiam. Domo. Latro*. In Cic. ad Att. 4. 1. 1 would strike out *nec* and put a comma between *me* and *ipsum*. This change frees Cicero from the charge of ingratitude, and substitutes *ipsum etiam* for the dubious *nec etiam*. In Phil. 1. 24 *domo* is used in a double sense, implying that the documents produced by Antony are "home-made". The legend that Rome was founded by robbers arose from a misunderstanding of the meaning of *latro*, which originally meant a soldier.

O. Densusianu, Zu "bubia" Arch. X. 228. The existence of this word is made probable by Roumanian *imbuibare* for Vulg. Lat. **imbubiare*, "eat to repletion."

O. Densusianu, *Carrus, das Sternbild des Bären*. This meaning of *carrus*, which is preserved in all the Romance languages, is not recognized by the Latin lexicons, but is found in Corp. Gloss. III. 425. 20-30.

426-444. Review of the Literature for 1900, 1901.

445-453. E. Wölfflin, *Zur Latinität der Epitome Caesarum*. The *Epitome* is at least a generation later than the *Caesares* of Aurelius Victor, since it extends to the death of Theodosius (395); and it is written from a different point of view, following the biographies of Sueton. and the *Script. Hist. Aug.*, rather than Tacitus and Ammianus. The writer's own language is best studied in chapters 40-48, where he ceases to follow his sources closely; it is inferior to that of Aurelius Victor. Some peculiarities are noted in the use of the personal and demonstrative

pronouns, and of prepositions, as well as in the comparison of adjectives.

453-454. E. Wölfflin, *Matrem gerere*. Defends the reading *lupa . . . matrem (se) gessit*, in *Flor.* 1. 1. 3, against *matrem egit* of *Cod. Bamberg*.

454. E. Wölfflin, *Agricola = Agricolus*. Suggests that the original nom. of *agricola* was *agricolas*, corresponding to *paricidas* (*Paul. Fest.*, p. 221).

455-463. G. Landgraf, *Ueber das Alter der Martial-Lemmata in den Handschriften der Familie B.* The language of these is that of the writers of the fourth or fifth century, and the lemmata are to be assigned to the Gennadius to whom the rescension of the B codices is due, or to his assistants. He is identified with the person addressed in Claudian's letter *ad Gennadium proconsulem*.

463-464. H. Moeller, *Ferens*. The citation *ferens turis* from *Manil.* V. 340 is incorrect in *Thes. L. L.*, s. v. II 2, since *turis* depends on *ignem* farther on in the sentence. *Ferens* is used absolutely in a middle sense. Of this use, already known in *Nepos*, *Dat.* 4. 5., M. gives two additional examples, *Manil.* 5. 395 and *Egnatius ap. Macr.* 6. 5. 2.

465-472. G. Landgraf, *Die Hegesippus-Frage*. (Dedicated to Wölfflin on his 71st birthday.) Shows by an examination of the language and style of the Latin version of the *History of Josephus*, sometimes attributed to Hegesippus, that Reifferscheid was right in saying that it was unquestionably the work of Ambrosius.

473-477. Meader-Wölfflin, *Zur Geschichte der Pronomina demonstrativa*, IV. A continuation of the article on pp. 355 ff.

477. P. Wessner, *Oricula*. This orthography occurs in *Donat. Eun.* 539, where instead of *oculis accipiat*, we should read *oriculis accipiat*.

477-478. *Amusus*. This word should be read in *Donat. Eun.* 3. 3. 31.

478. E. Wölfflin, *Os umerosque deo similis*. In this passage (*Verg., Aen.* 1. 589) *similis* is equivalent to *assimilatus*, with the force of the middle voice. In *Tac. Ann.* 6. 9 the construction *clari genus* is poetic usage.

479-550. P. Maas, *Studien zum poetischen Plural bei den Römern*. The term poetic plural is defined as covering those instances in which prose under the same circumstances has the singular, excluding, of course, prose with a poetic coloring. The existence of the so-called *pluralis maiestaticus* is denied, and in general all efforts to assign to the plural a special shade of meaning is regarded as a mistaken one. The usage is found to be of

Greek origin, extended however by the large number of words in Latin which are plural in form, but singular in meaning. It is confined to certain words and to certain cases, and shows a regular development. In many instances it is to be explained on metrical grounds, since the singular will not fit into dactylic verse. Euphony also has its influence, as well as a desire to differentiate the poetic from the colloquial language. A special investigation is made of the plural in the case of expressions denoting mass and in those denoting parts of the body. The former are in part archaisms, which came into the poetical from the colloquial language. Here, too, prosody had an influence, particularly in the case of nouns of the so-called second declension with a trochee before the case-ending, as well as euphony. The use of words denoting parts of the body in the plural is unlimited only in the nom. and acc.; in the other cases it is never the rule, and it is exceptional with neuters. The paper, which cannot well be reduced to an abstract, is full of suggestions for further investigation. It is provided with an index.

551-559. E. Lommatzsch, *Zur Mulomedicina Chironis II.* A continuation of the article on pp. 401 ff.

560. E. Wölfflin, *Uber, Upera*. Instead of the singular of the cod. Bamberg., the plural should be read in Flor. 1. 1. 3, on the ground of general usage, of which instances are cited.

560. J. Cornu, *Foevea = fovea*. In *Corp. Script. Eccl. Lat.* 18, p. 86, l. 10, *foveam* is read for *foveam*. *Foeveam = foiviam* is a new example of the attraction of the semi-vowel *i*; see Schuchardt, *Vokalismus*. II. 528-539.

561-578. G. Landgraf-C. Weyman, *Die Epitome des Iulius Exsuperantius*. Text with critical apparatus and commentary.

578. E. Lattes, *Ab und Caitho*. The Etruscan cognomen *Ab* (CIL. XI. 2038 = CIE. 4279, *A. Caitho Ab*) is not found in the *Thes. L. L.* It is probably an abbreviation of *Aber* for *Haber = Faber*. Some parallels to *Caitho* are also cited.

579-587. *Miscellen*. J. M. Stowasser, *Abaso*. This word, which has been admitted to the *Thes. L. L.*, is a mere misspelling of *agaso*.

Eb. Nestle, *Dextrator*, *δεξιολάβος*. Compares *dextrator*, found in CIL. VIII. 2532, with *δεξιολάβος*, in Act. Apost. 23. 23 of which it may be the Latin translation.

F. Sommer, *Bīduom und trīduom*. The long *i* is explained as due to compensatory lengthening, rather than to the analogy of *prīdiē* and *postrīdiē*. The words are formed from **bisduom* and **trisduom*, earlier **dvis divom* and **tris divom*. *Quadrīduom* is formed on the analogy of these two words.

A. Zimmerman, *Zur Bildung der lateinischen Personennamen*. Cites instances of Reduplication (Mama: Ma, and with broken reduplication, Amma); of Shortening (Cassius: Κάσσανδρος; Philomusus: Musa: Mus); of the use of the Greek fem. suffix -is in Latin names (Montana: Montanis; Nona: Nonis; Plenia: Plenis), of the ending -ucus (Caducus, Manduccus, with the development of a gentile suffix in -icius: Abuccius, Callucia, etc.); of the insertion of s through error (Caius Spontius, Scalvinus, Scatia, Stersita); of the substitution of a more convenient ending (Secus for Secuns: Praesta for Praestans: Princus for Princeps?).

588-602. Review of the Literature for 1900, 1901, 1902.

602. Berichtigung zu besta. The examples from Lact., given on p. 400, must be abandoned. So also the one from Primasius, cited by Hausleiter.

JOHN C. ROLFE.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXXVII (1908).

Janvier.

Ernest Muret. *De quelques Désinences de Noms de Lieu particulièrement fréquentes dans la Suisse romande et en Savoie*. 46 pages. The theory has long been held that a large number of place-names in French Switzerland and in Eastern France are derived from Germanic names, but the present article aims to show that this was not the case and that most of them are of Gallo-Roman origin. The questions discussed are matters of chronology and etymology.

Joseph Bédier. *Les Chansons de Geste et les routes d'Italie*. 33 pages. In this the concluding article of the series various legends concerning Italian towns are mentioned, including that of the birth of Roland at Imola. Next the various ports of embarkation from Italy for the Oriental pilgrimage are discussed, together with the epic legends connected with them. In conclusion the author examines all the places in Italy which are not on the pilgrimage routes but which are nevertheless mentioned in French epics; these places, however, are for the most part mentioned rather incidentally.

Pio Rajna. *L'Attila di Nicolò da Càsola sulle orme di una pubblicazione recente e con riguardo ad un'altra*. 21 pages. The Attila legend has shown a remarkable vitality in Italy for many centuries past, and has been the subject of numerous investigations. In the present article especial attention is paid to the Franco-Italian poem by Nicolò da Càsola, which possesses many points of interest to the Mediævalist.

A. Thomas. Notes étymologiques et lexicographiques. 29 pages. A long discussion of the etymologies of a large number of words belonging to the French and Provençal dialects.

B. Schüdel. La Frontière entre le Gascon et le Catalan. 17 pages. In Gröber's Grundriss the limits of these two forms of speech are indicated as coinciding with the political frontier between France and Spain following the crest of the Pyrenees. It is here shown, however, that the considerable region known as the Val d'Aran, though belonging politically to Spain, is linguistically a part of France. The relative difficulty of the various mountain passes largely determines the dialectic limits.

Mélanges. Johan Vising, Franç. desver, resver <*deastuare, *reaestuar. Giulio Bertoni, Sur la mort de Lambertino Buvaletti. Bernard Heller, L'Épée symbole et gardienne de chasteté (supplément). Walter W. Skeat, Franç. haquenée.

Comptes rendus. J. Runeberg, Études sur la Geste Rainouart (Raymond Weeks). Léopold Delisle, Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V (P. M.). Joseph Anglade, Le troubadour Guiraut Riquier: Étude sur la décadence de l'ancienne poésie provençale (A. Thomas). Albert Dauzat, Essai de méthodologie linguistique dans le domaine des langues et des patois romans (A. Thomas). D. Rouso, Studii bizantino-romîne (Mario Roques).

Périodiques. Studi glottologici italiani, IV (M. R.). Bulletin de la Société de linguistique de Paris, XII-XIV (A. Th.). Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXI (P. M., with numerous criticisms). Transactions of the Philological Society, III (P. M.). Bulletin de la Société des anciens textes français, 1907.

Chronique. Obituary notices of L. Traube and Alphonse Roque-Ferrier. Account of the publications of the Gesellschaft für romanische Literatur. Completion of the second edition of Ulysse Chevalier's Répertoire des sources historiques du moyen âge: Bio-bibliographie.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 16 titles. A. W. Ward and A. R. Waller, The Cambridge History of English Literature, Vol. I: From the Beginnings to the Cycles of Romance (P. Meyer says that it is in general inferior to the similar work by W. H. Schofield). The Song of Roland, newly translated into English by Jessie Crosland.

Avril.

Auguste Longnon. Nouvelles Observations sur Raoul de Cambrai. 16 pages. Nearly thirty years ago a critical edition of Raoul de Cambrai was published by Paul Meyer and Auguste Longnon. Recently Joseph Bédier has attempted to upset the

theory of the origin of this epic advanced by the editors. One of the latter now returns to the charge and reaffirms the original theory of the relative antiquity of the poem.

Paul Meyer. Notice du ms. 25970 de la Bibliothèque Phillipps (Cheltenham). 27 pages. P. Meyer first saw this fragment of a manuscript at the Savile sale in London in 1861, and since then has studied it at Cheltenham. It contains several well-known Old-French poems and others that have so far escaped attention. Most famous among the former is a version of the fabliau known as *La housse partie*. The poems are of Anglo-Norman origin, and they present many points of interest.

Paul Meyer. Melior et Ydoine. 9 pages. This Old-French dit is preserved in a Cambridge manuscript, and its publication was announced by P. Meyer more than twenty years ago. It is in the form of a debate on the famous question of knowing "quel vaut mieux a amer, gentil clerc ou chivaler."

Gaston Raynaud. Renart le Contrefait et ses deux rédactions. 39 pages. A clerk of Troyes, having embarked in commercial pursuits with considerable success, determined to write a satire on his times in the form of the Renart stories. He completed his work in the years 1320 to 1322, but having meanwhile become well-advanced in years he determined to rewrite his poem so as to make it rather a work of edification than one of satire. This he did between the years 1328 and 1342, thereby bringing the total number of verses in the two versions up to no less than seventy-five thousand. The author of the present article has analysed and compared the two versions of this immense compilation of history, legend and anecdote.

A. Thomas. Remarques sur la Dissimilation consonantique à propos d'un article de M. Maurice Grammont. 10 pages. Maurice Grammont has devoted a great deal of attention to dissimilation in the Indo-European languages and has reached the conclusion that this phenomenon is best exemplified in the Romance languages. A. Thomas here discusses the author's general principles as to the theory of dissimilation and raises a number of objections to those stated by his predecessor in this field.

Mélanges. A. Jeanroy, Fr. qui vive: A. Jeanroy, Anc. fr. anesser. Gaston Bigot, L'article Estave de Godefroy. G. Huet, Ogre dans le Conte du Graal de Chrétien de Troyes. A. Thomas, Messin loraige. A. Thomas, Prov. malavei, malavejar.

Comptes rendus. Wilhelm Nyman, Étude sur les adjectifs, les participes et les nombres ordinaux substantivés en vieux provençal (E. Walberg). J. Reinhold, Floire et Blancheflor: Étude de littérature comparée (Lucien Lécureux). Artur Långfors, Li regrès Nostre-Dame par Huon le roi de Cambrai, publié d'après

tous les manuscrits connus (P. M.). Joseph Huber, *L'Évangile de l'Enfance en provençal* (P. M.). L. Berthoud et L. Matruchot, *Étude historique et étymologique des noms de lieux habités du département de la Côte-d'Or*: I. Période anté-romaine; II. Période gallo-romaine (première partie) (A. Thomas). O. Schultz-Gora, *Altprovenzalisches Elementarbuch* (A. Thomas). Michele Barbi, *La Vita Nuova* (Paget Toynbee). Henri Chate-lain, *Recherches sur le vers français au XV^e siècle, rimes, mètres et strophes* (A. Jeanroy).

Chronique. Announcement of critical editions of Old-French texts soon to be published. The newly-formed Société internationale de dialectologie romane of Brussels.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 7 titles. Georges Doutre-pont, *Inventaire de la librairie de Philippe le Bon* (1420). Emil Freymond, *Eine Prager Handschrift der Lamentations de Matheolus und des Livre de Leëse*.

Juillet.

Francesco Lo Parco. *Il Petrarca e gli Antipodi etnografici in rapporto con la concezione patristica e dantesca*. 21 pages. Petrarch's geographical notions have often been the subject of study and discussion, but his ideas of cosmography have never been carefully investigated. His chief sources of information appear to have been St. Isidor of Seville and the early Church Fathers.

Paul Meyer. *Recettes médicales en Français publiées d'après le ms. B. N. lat. 8654 B.* 20 pages. Medical science was at a standstill during the Middle Ages, and physicians were obliged to depend on collections of recipes handed down from former times for the treatment of diseases. Most of these are written in Latin, but occasionally French translations of them were made especially for the use of women. These collections of recipes are now of interest to us chiefly from a lexicological standpoint, or as curious bits of information concerning home remedies and herb teas.

Ernest Muret. *De quelques Désinences de Noms de Lieu particulièrement fréquentes dans la Suisse romande et en Savoie* (Suite). 43 pages. In this long instalment of his article the author discusses the etymologies of hundreds of geographical names having various characteristic endings.

G. Lavergne. *Documents du XIV^e Siècle en Langage de Sarlat* (Dordogne). 11 pages. A selection of charts from among a large number coming down to the time of the Revolution is here published with historical and geographical notes.

Mélanges. A. Thomas, *Franç. vernis*. Mario Roques, *Avenril, blaeril, etc.*

Comptes rendus. *Melanges Chabaneau*, 4 mars 1906 (A. Thomas, with summaries of the eighty-one articles which compose it). E. Besta et P. E. Guarnerio, *Carta de Logu de Arborea* (Jacob Jud). P. E. Guarnerio, *L'Antico Campidanese dei sec. XI-XIII secondo le Antiche carte volgari dell' Archivio Arcivescovile di Cagliari* (Jacob Jud). Max Leopold Wagner, *Lautlehre der südsardischen Mundarten, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der um den Gennargentu gesprochenen Varietäten* (Jacob Jud). Lazare Sainéan, *L'Argot ancien (1455-1850): Ses éléments constitutifs, ses rapports avec les langues secrètes de l'Europe méridionale et l'argot moderne, avec un appendice sur l'argot jugé par Victor Hugo et Balzac* (P. M.). Dr. Eugene Ulrix, *De germaansche Elementen in de romaansche Talen: Proeve van een germaansch-romaansch Woordenboek* (A. Thomas).

Périodiques. *Revue des langues romanes*, L (P. Meyer). *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXI. 4-5 (Mario Roques, with lengthy discussion of etymologies). *Annales du Midi*, XIX (A. Thomas). *Reale Istituto lombardo di Scienze e Lettere, Rendiconti, série II*, vol. XL. *The Modern Language Review*, II (P. M.).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Alfred Straccali and Émile Galtier. P. Meyer gives a long note on Prof. F. M. Warren's articles in *Modern Language Notes* on the Escoufle, Guillaume de Dole, Ombre and Galeran: "M. W. qui, en d'autres occasions déjà, a donné la preuve du soin et de la critique avec lesquels il étudie les particularités de style et de versification de nos vieux poèmes, s'efforce d'établir . . . que les trois premiers de ces poèmes sont l'œuvre d'un même écrivain."

Livres annoncés sommairement. 12 titles. George Fitch McKibben, *The Eructavit, an Old-French Poem: The author's environment, his argument and materials* (Chicago diss.). Hope Traver, *The Four Daughters of God: A study of the versions of this allegory with special reference to those in Latin, French and English* (Bryn Mawr diss.). Ad. Tobler, *Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik, Vierte Reihe*.

Auguste Longnon, *Encore quelques mots à propos de Raoul de Cambrai* (a species of appendix).

Octobre.

Mario Roques. *Le Plus Ancien Texte Rétique*. 12 pages. A Latin sermon in a manuscript of the eighth or ninth century preserved at Einsiedeln was partially translated into Rhaetian in the twelfth century by interlinear additions of about one hundred words. This short Romance text has already been the subject of three articles, and will probably lead to the writing of yet others from time to time. It offers many difficulties in interpretation, and has many points of linguistic interest.

P. Meyer. Notice du ms. Bodley 761 de la Bibliothèque Bodléienne (Oxford). 20 pages. The manuscript here analysed contains a variety of works in Latin and French written by various scribes of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. P. Meyer studies with especial care a number of medical recipes which are of lexicological interest. There are also chronicles, prophecies and many other interesting minor works in the manuscript which are passed in review rather rapidly.

Marcel Lecourt. Notice sur l'Histoire des Neuf Preux et des Neuf Preues de Sébastien Mamerot. 9 pages. The Imperial Library of Vienna contains a unique manuscript in two large volumes of an unpublished work by Sébastien Mamerot composed in 1460. In 1807 Napoleon had the manuscript sent from Vienna to Paris, whence it was no doubt returned after the Battle of Waterloo. The *explicit* is explicit in its statements: "Cy finissent les fais des Neuf Preues escrips par moy Robert Briart, du diocèse de Bayeux, en la cité de Troyes en Champagne en l'an mil CCCC soixante et douze."

A. Thomas. Notes Biographiques et Bibliographiques sur Sébastien Mamerot. 3 pages. Citation of charts and other evidence pertaining to the literary field in question.

Ernest Muret. De quelques Désinences de Noms de Lieu particulièrement fréquentes dans la Suisse romande et en Savoie (Suite et fin). 30 pages. This concluding instalment is devoted to the study of place-names of apparently Ligurian origin, thus carrying us back to the dim prehistoric times which preceded the Celtic invasion and the Roman conquest of Switzerland and Savoy.

Fr. Schumacher. Les Éléments narratifs de la Passion d'Autun et les Indications scéniques du Drame médiéval. 24 pages. This piece has such a large proportion of narrative passages that there seems to be a question as to whether it was ever intended for dramatic representation at all. The author of the article discusses four different theories to account for the narrative passages.

A. Thomas. Le Nom et la Famille de Jehan de Monstereul. 9 pages. Having found certain documents referring to two houses in Paris owned by Jehan de Monstereul, the author has in vain attempted to identify them in person. Parchment and paper are oftentimes worth more than stone and marble.

Mélanges. A. Thomas, Anc. franç. senechier, senegier. A. T. Baker, Sur un morceau de Robert de Blois contenu dans le manuscrit 3516 de l'Arsenal.

Comptes rendus. R. L. Graeme Ritchie, Recherches sur la syntaxe de la conjonction "que" dans l'ancien français depuis les origines de la langue jusqu'au commencement du XIII^e

siècle (Henri Yvon). E. Langlois, *Nouvelles françaises inédites du XV^e siècle* (A. Thomas). Alphonse Meillon, *Esquisse toponymique sur la vallée de Cauterets (Hautes-Pyrénées)* (A. Thomas). A. G. Little, *Liber exemplorum ad usum praedicatorum saeculo XIII compositus a quodam fratre minore anglico de provincia Hiberniae* (P. Meyer). Jean Ducamin, Pierre Alphonse: *Disciplines de clergie et de moralités traduites en gascon girondin du XIV^e-XV^e siècle* (P. Meyer).

Périodiques. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, XXXI. 6 (Mario Roques, with discussion of etymologies). *Bulletin archéologique du Comité des Travaux historiques et scientifiques*, 1906-1907 (P. M.). *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, IX (P. M.).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Camille Chabaneau, F. Arnaud, Charles Lenient and Charles Aubertin.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 12 titles. *Miscellanea di Studi critici pubblicati in onore di Guido Mazzoni*. Lucy E. Farrer, *La vie et les œuvres de Claude de Sainliens alias Claudius Holyband*. Joseph Buckeley, *Beiträge zur französischen Ortsnamenforschung*.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Dr. Schlutter's article from the American Journal of Philology (XXIX 432-448) is obviously of great importance as pointing to the sources of so many of the glosses from Gildas. The references are most acceptable and valuable.

There is an English translation of Gildas by Dr. Giles, in the volume of Bohn's Library entitled Six Old English Chronicles. It is very easy to find the quotations in it; and it has a certain value as giving a translation from an independent point of view. Dr. Giles of course never studied the glosses; and he seems to me to give a very fair general view of the sense.

I cannot say, however, that I am in the least convinced as to an A. S. *lupa*, meaning "a loop". I have come back to an opinion which I had thirty years ago, that *loop* is not a native word at all, but a dialectal or Northern English word, of Celtic origin. This is the very view now adopted in the New English Dictionary as being the likeliest.

The modern E. *oo* usually results from an A. S. *ō*. The chief exceptions are due to a preceding *r*, as in *rūm*, room; *drūpa*, to droop; *brūcan*, to brook (with *oo* shortened before final *k*); all as cited at the bottom of p. 432. I do not accept the other examples as being to the point. *Uncouth* is somewhat of a poetical word; and in Shakespeare was *ūn-cūth*, with the stress on the former syllable, and consequent shortening of the A. S. *ū* to the *u* in *full*. But at the present time, there is a tendency to accent the second syllable, which again lengthens it, and so reproduces, accidentally as it were, the original sound. N. E. *pook* is dialectal; the standard form is *Puck*, with a short *u* before *k*. *Sloom* is mere dialect; and so is *cooscot*, usually spelt *cushat*, which has the same *u* as in *Puck*. The only form left, viz. *stoop*, as from *stupian*, is easily accounted for as having been preserved by the preceding *st*, precisely as the old *ea* is preserved in *steak*, which is to be compared with *great* (with *gr*) and *break* (with *br*), as against all other examples such as *heat*, *beat*, etc. That a preceding *l* does not preserve an A. S. *ū*, we know by the example of *look*; which is not from **lūcian*, but from *lōcian*, regularly. I connect *loop* with the Gaelic *lúb*, "a bend, a curvature, a bending of the shore, a loop, a noose, a winding, meander, maze"; Macleod. Very striking is the sense of "winding" or "meander"; because Jamieson notes that in Lanarkshire the pl. *loops* signifies "the windings of a river or rivulet". O'Reilly's Irish Dictionary has: "*Lub*, s. f., a loop, bow, staple, plait, fold, thong, maze,

meander", etc. It is really Celtic, because *lubtha*, "bent", occurs in Old Irish, as noted by Windisch. The root-sense of *loop* is simply "a bend", not "a noose", though the latter sense soon arose. Even now, it implies the idea of a long oval rather than of a ring or circle. It is not known in English earlier than 1400.

I cannot find either "a loop" or "a noose" or "a leash" in *catasta*. I understand *Molossorum catasta* as meaning "a crowd or pack of mastiffs". A Molossian dog was a kind of mastiff (N. E. D.); not the kind of dog to be held in a leash. And *caterva* never meant a loop or leash or lead; but simply a company, crowd, or large number. A *leash* never included more than *three* dogs at most; *leash* often had the sense of "three". This is not what we want.

Catasta was a stage, a scaffold, an instrument of torture; hence, a thing of terror, a threatening crowd, a formidable pack. At p. 311 of Six Eng. Chron., Dr. Giles has: "Their mother-land . . . sends forth a *larger company* of her wolfish offspring", to translate "item mittit satellitum canumque prolixiorum catastam". This seems to me to give the right sense of "prolixiorum catastam". It means that there was a large pack of them, and all loose. The gloss *werod* is perfectly right. "Throng" or "pack" gives the sense we want.

This is why I remain unconvinced as to *lupa*. But Schlutter's tract, in general, is excellent.

WALTER W. SKEAT.

BRIEF MENTION.

Translations and no end! If the malevolent reader will scan the lists of *Books Received*, he may behold to the satisfaction of his wicked heart how many versions there are to challenge criticism, how many rival renderings to demand comparison. And there is no sharper knife wherewith to pry the classical oyster out of his shell than the familiar question one encounters in literary and semi-literary circles: 'What do you think of Mr. Somebody's translation?' 'For decency' sake one dare not borrow Thackeray's answer when questioned about the Proverbial Philosophy of Mr. Martin Farquhar Tupper, which for some moons was an immensely popular performance. 'I do not think of Mr. Tupper at all'. Translations by certain hands are literary events, although such achievements as Fitzgerald's Omar Khayyám are not to be classed as translations. For years there was no translation of Euripides that one need consider; that is, no translation of any large number of Euripidean plays, but then came Mr. WAY and now comes Mr. GILBERT MURRAY, whose praise is in all the journals. But the Hellenist asks himself with a groan: Why have I acquired a direct vision of a language through years of study and contemplation, if I am to spend the few remaining hours of a busy life in hopeless admiration of a facility that is beyond my reach or in utter detestation of some distortion or discoloration of the original? 'Mon verre n'est pas grand, mais je bois dans mon verre' and the alien cup is often a quassia cup or a queasy cup. 'Lächerlich ist es', says the Altmeister Boeckh, 'wenn man behauptet der vollendetste Uebersetzer sei auch der vollendetste Philologe'.

Of course, I am no enemy of translation. In fact, it is an inevitable part of a teacher's work, one that he must not put off on the boys, contenting himself with easy criticism of their performances. The lesson ought to be translated by the teacher himself as a review. The translation serves as a manner of commentary and incidentally as a lesson in aesthetics. In the earlier ranges of instruction, in the period before the student has been taught to appreciate the impossibility of translation, the teacher must sacrifice himself. I have yellow reams of translations of Herodotos into the language of the Authorized Version and Thukydides into the language of the early eighteenth century, of Aischylos, of Sophokles in the metres of the original, whose end

is to be burned. I should no more think of perpetuating those things than a lecturer on art would think of perpetuating the chalk diagrams by which he illustrates his course. Such things serve a temporary purpose as incitements, if not exemplars, to the pupil. But if one reads one's own translation too much, there is a danger which it fills one with horror to contemplate—the possibility of remembering one's own rendering and forgetting the original.

Sometimes, it is true, the translation is better than the original from the point of view of art. The Tudor translations, so far as I know them, are delightful studies, original or no original. And 'Nachdichten'—that is a different matter. The echo sometimes penetrates the heart deeper than the original note. I can well understand the case when one has to imagine an original to get the right tone as in 'Sonnets from the Portuguese'. There is such a thing as a Roman, an Hellenic frame of mind. But these meditations are moving along lower lines, the lines of translation proper. Apart from the rendering of the sense, the translator has to consider the form.

Artistic prose, with its subtleties of rhythm, which we have just begun to appreciate, is a problem impossible of solution. What is hiatus to us or we to hiatus? What can we do with the simple recipe of Paeon Primus for the opening and Paeon Quartus for the close of a period? Some people's notion of English rhythmical prose is bad blank verse. It is all a matter of ear with us. Science has not untwisted the chains of the harmonies of English prose. How far our sense of such things corresponds to the antique, how far it is derived unawares from familiarity with the antique, is a matter for further study. We talk of Ciceronian periods in English, and yet the accomplished Irish editor of Cicero's Letters declines to discuss Zielinski and the rest of them. But poetry is another matter and the attempt to render the metres of the original goes very far back. However, this is not a history of English metres, but the confession of a disillusioned schoolmaster. The English hexameter is a hopeless medium for the rendering of the classic hexameter. It may be no worse than the classic hexameter as it is so often read, and in the hands of a true poet may develop a rude life of its own, but as a medium of translation, it is too painfully suggestive; and the elegiac distich has always left me in despair. The English iambic trimeter—I have composed thousands of them in my time—is a failure. Our monosyllabic language makes padding a necessity, makes it almost impossible to avoid an occasional break in the middle of the verse. It is a stuffed figure, a jointed doll. We can't revive the Alexandrine. We can't read Drayton

with any patience. As for the lyric measures, that is a different thing. There are many dactylotrochaic, not to say logaoedic, measures, that have at least to my ear the same *ethos* in English as in Greek. The so-called greater Asclepiadean measure of Horace's 'Tu ne quaesieris' might well serve for haunting melancholy in English as in Greek, as in Latin. To the examples cited, A. J. P. XVI 394, add Kallimachos, A. P. XIII 10:

ἀ ναῦς ἀ τὸ μόνον φέγγος ἐμὶν τὸ γλυκὺ τᾶς ζῴης
ἄρπαξας κτέ.,

and one must not overlook the unsatisfied desire of the folk-song which bears strong testimony to the *athos* of the measure:

ἀ ὅς τὰν βάλανον τὰν μὲν ἔχει τὰν δ' ἔραται λαβεῖν.

This measure which is that of Sappho's *κατθανοῖσα δὲ κείσεται* has caught the ear of several translators. To Wharton's specimen I add the rendering given in Professor Shorey's Horace, Od. IV 9, the best I have seen:

Thou shalt die and be laid low in the grave, hidden from mortal
ken,
Unremembered and no song of the Muse wakens thy name
again;
No Pierian rose brightens thy brow, lost in the nameless throng.
Thy dark spirit shall flit forth like a dream bodiless ghosts
among.

Many, many years ago I was so much in earnest about the importance of transplanting these lighter measures into English that I conceived the notion of substituting for the *conspectus metrorum* in Horace a set of English rhymes which should convey the rhythm to beginners, at least, after a fashion. This method of accentuating the movement of hexameter and pentameter is an old story. Witness the leonine verse and the rhymed pentameter so common in the Roman elegiac poets. And it came into fashion again. Some forty years ago I actually went so far as to publish under strict anonymity an imitation of Horace's *Ad Thaliarchum*—itself an imitation—prefacing it, however, with an appeal for mercy.

Forgive Alcaeus, if I have borrowed rhyme
A Northern sleighbell fastened to Pegasus
To mark thy music by its tinkle
Hater of Myrsilus, bard of Lesbos.

As for the rhymed Alcaics one will more than suffice,

The rain it raineth: deep is the snow without
The wind it plaineth: now for a drinking bout
Pile high the fuel, fierce and cruel
Rages the rainy and windy duel.

About that time some Boanerges of a critic uttered his voice and I abandoned my scheme.

But what of analogous metre? This is what Wilamowitz aims at in his renderings (A. J. P. XIII 577). But the trouble is that there is no agreement as to the *ethos*. The *ethos* comes largely from association of ideas. When a German poet undertook to translate Byron's *Belshazzar's Feast*, a German critic fell foul of his countryman for the employment of female rhymes and profanely compared the movement to that of the *Volkslied*: *Als einst ich auf der Bleiche*. And so what I am about to write may call forth similar ridicule, and yet I am tempted to say a word in behalf of an English measure, which, as it seems to me, has not found all the favor with translators that it deserves. It is the English iambic dipody. Schipper treats it scurvily and considers it a fissiparous generation of the iambic tetrapody. It happens to be my favorite metre for social versicles and doubtless will be Till from on high Thou call me home, as the old hymn has it. As a clausula it is admirable. It has the effect of reconsideration, just the effect that the pentameter has over against the hexameter. Hymnwriters are not averse to it as in 'Lead thou me on', but it seems to have been very little used by the translators of the Anthology. One notable exception is Hobbes. Now Hobbes was not a highly gifted translator and I once made a long search through his *Odyssey* in order to find a confirmation of my rash thesis that a man translated best that with which he was most in sympathy. And finally I had to put up with his version of the Song of the Sirens. But after all there are worse translations of the famous epitaph on Archedice (Thuk. 6, 59):

Archedice, the daughter of King Hippas,
Who in his time
Of all the potentates of Greece was prime,
This dust doth hide.
Daughter, wife, mother unto kings she was
Yet free from pride.

But if neglected by the translators of the Anthology the translators of Sappho in Mr. Wharton's collection make not infrequent use of it and effective use of it. As an independent verse, the English iambic dipody has the same disadvantages that the pentameter has as an independent verse, but the epigraphic origin of the iambic dipody commends it to favor, despite the association with the New England Primer. 'My book and heart Shall never part'. It is a favorite posy verse. It is the verse for rings, for kiss papers. It lends itself to light and airy subjects. It is not incompatible with grave themes. A French poet, Richépin, whom I do not make my constant companion, uses it with fine effect in his *Caresses*.

Au vent du nord
Qui le bâtonne
Le pauvre Automne
Fuit sans remords.

Le vent le mord,
Lui dans sa tonne
Se pelotonne,
L'Automne est mort.

Et son glas tinte
Comme une plainte
Dans les derniers

Refrains de fête,
Adieu, paniers,
Vendange est faite.

'Et son glas tinte'. There is the toll I seem to hear in one of my favorite epitaphs, one that holds the lesson of many a life besides my own and many experiments in rhyme besides my own.

Ναυηγού τάφος εἰμί. σὺ δὲ πλέε. καὶ γὰρ ὅθ' ἡμεῖς
ᾠλλύμεθ', αἱ λοιπαὶ νῆες ἐποντοπόρου.

Shipwreck'd was he
Whose tomb you see.
But hold your way.
For on the day
When we were lost
The others cross'd.

All this flood of memories has been let loose by a recent work of Mr. BITHELL's, *The Minnesingers*, Vol. I. *Translations* (New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1909). These translations go farther down than the period of the Minnesingers proper and I recognize many old favorites from *Des Knaben Wunderhorn*, which was the delight of my youth. Among the rest Mr. BITHELL has tried his hand on the hearty old Tannhäuser Lay, which tempted me also in my translating days, and my version of which, somewhat doctored, may be found in my *Essays and Studies* (p. 189 foll.). Which of the two is the greater failure, I will not attempt to decide, although I am absolutely impersonal as to my literary performances of forty years syne. At any rate, I can say for myself that I have stuck closer to my text than Mr. BITHELL, and while I sympathize with him heartily in sending Pope Urban to hell instead of Tannhäuser, I felt bound to follow the ballad in reserving the knight for the judgment day. The last feeble verse Mr. BITHELL perhaps does well to omit, and I myself have commented on the prosaic effect of the tag, and yet in view of my sins and the sins of my fellow-translators I am fain to say,

Dass soll nimmer kein <Richter> thun,
Dem Menschen Misstrost geben,
Wil er denn Buss' und Reu' empfahn,
Die Sünde sei ihm vergeben.

And surely my penitence is sincere enough and poignant enough.

The playful allusion to PLACIDO CESAREO in the last number of the Journal had passed into irrevocable print before I became aware that Cesareo with his young wife had perished in the disastrous earthquake at Messina. One of his colleagues has paid a tribute to his memory in the April number of the *Rivista di Filologia* with a singularly just estimate of the scholar who has come to so untimely an end. He was too eager to assimilate everything that had been written on his subject and shewed too little discrimination as to the value of his authorities. His identification of ancient and modern tendencies in literature bordered on the fantastic. What do we really gain by comparing Kallimachos with the decadents of our time? But who that loves life is not tempted in the same way? Who is not tempted to apply the Bertillon method to the scamps of all the ages? Veder troppo, says the Italian commentator on Cesareo's career, veder troppo è meglio che veder niente e agli effetti della vita operativa l'alluazione è preferibile al letargo. And so we leave him.

In my note on Persius 5, 181 I remarked somewhat petulantly: 'Those who wish illustrations for what they can see with their own eyes may consult Friedländer'. But how many people, how many scholarly people see with their own eyes? Pindar's ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι αἰδαί lay hid in night until Mr. W. R. Paton suggested the true explanation in the Classical Review for June, 1888. The personified songs, like Eastern dancers, plastered their faces with silver coins. The matter was taken up in the October number of the same periodical by Mr. J. G. Frazer and there is no longer any guessing as to Pindar's meaning. And as Mr. Ellis illuminates his commentary on Avianus (Fab. 8) by a quotation from Uncle Remus, so the exegete of Pindar, I, 2, 8, might draw his illustration from a vivid chapter of The Garden of Allah. In like manner I found the other day in a novel which abounds in close observation of rural life, John Galsworthy's *The Country House* (p. 141), a sentence which I should have been glad to use in vindication of my exegesis of Pindar, P. 2, 80: ἀγὰν πᾶγχυ διαπλέκει, of which feeble fun has been made of late years (A. J. P. XXVIII 109). '<The dog>', says Mr. Galsworthy, 'stood there curved in a half-circle and deeply wagged that which had been left him of his tail', as scholars often deeply wag that which has been left them of their sense.

Professor MUTZBAUER has completed his *Grundlagen der griechischen Tempuslehre u. der homerische Tempusgebrauch* by the publication of a second volume (Strassburg. K. J. Trübner, 1909). In the Introduction he sums up his main contentions,

which lack the charm of novelty. The work, it seems, has been completed for years and the author disclaims responsibility for its late appearance. No one will be surprised at Professor MUTZBAUER'S insistence on the importance of the 'Zeitart' in Greek (A. J. P. XXIII 242; XXIX 389), on the purely inferential character of temporal interrelations, such as contemporaneousness and priority (A. J. P. XXIX 395), on the lack in Greek of any dominant historical tense (A. J. P. XXIX 243, XXX 104), such as we find in Latin and German, on the natural affinity of the future for the aorist (A. J. P. XXXII 247), on the development of the *de conatu* sense of the present from the durative meaning of the tense (A. J. P. IV 161), on the unsatisfactory explanation of the gnomic aorist as an aorist of experience (A. J. P. XXIII 245), on the use of the perfect either as an intensive or as the expression of a condition (A. J. P. XXIX 335). In the list of Homeric verbs Professor MUTZBAUER is careful to note the range of the uses of the different tenses and he tries with dogged persistence to bring out the difference between imperfect and aorist by translation, translation, which, one cannot assert too often (A. J. P. XIX 231), even if it be in vain, is only an illustration, not a proof. Those who have read my *Problems in Greek Syntax* and my recent *Notes on Stahl* will hardly expect me to grind all this grist over again.

Some years ago commenting on Rutherford's *Scholia Aristophanica* I remarked on the needlessness of a rendering into English for those who are competent to use the scholia at all (A. J. P. XIX 347). So at first blush it seems strange that anyone should think of translating into English such a book as Kluge's *Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, a thing that actually happened in 1891. The translator excused himself on the ground that he aimed at making the book as comprehensible to English students as the original work is to German; and something is to be said in those cases, in which the translation is of service to the translator himself. And so without any disrespect to the perturbed spirit of Dr. Rutherford, whose scholarship was held in high esteem by his compatriots (C. R. XXI 190), and asserted with unsparing severity by his schoolmasterly nature (A. J. P. III 226; IV 86; XI 390; XXIV 104), it may be that Rutherford was trying to clarify his mind as to the meaning of his text. But he did not always succeed, as will presently appear. Just as I was reproaching myself with the unnecessary pother (XXX 231) I had made about *ψυχρότης* and *ψυχρόν* in the last number of the *Journal*, I picked up an old edition of Aristophanes and found that I had transcribed more than fifty years ago on the margin of Nub. 907: *δοτε μοι λεκάνην*, Friedrich August Wolf's scholion on the passage. It runs: *ἵνα τὴν χολὴν ἐμέσω' ὡς ναυτιῶν ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων ψυχρίας*

τῶν αὐτῶν σχεδόν, ἀ ὁ Εὐθύφρων λέγει παρὰ Πλάτωνι. This is the deathly nausea to which I referred (A. J. P. l. c.) and Wolf's note is taken in part from the Ravenna scholion: ὡς ναυτιῶν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου ψύχρας, which Rutherford renders thus: 'as though he were made sick by the other's cool impertinence' and I am comforted for my idle excursus on ψυχρότης and ψυχρόν.

All my philological work has been given to my little world in the mother-tongue, so that my occasional preachments in behalf of a return to Latin are at sad variance with the example I have set. But the doctrine is true despite the laches of the preacher, and the words of ROBINSON ELLIS in his Lecture on BREITER'S *Manilius* and FRIDERICH'S *Catullus* are well worth recording here. 'The very effort to express in a Latin commentary either kind of obscurity, obscurity in the subject matter, obscurity in the language, this very effort is calculated to produce the condensed terseness, without which any such exegesis is apt to become tedious, explaining too much or dwelling on details which are best left to the students' discretion'.

H. L. W.: M. Jules Maurice has for years been known as one of the most diligent students and one of the most able interpreters of the coinage of the period of Constantine. His numerous published discussions of numismatic subjects and especially his detailed accounts of the different mints of the Roman empire have made his name familiar to all readers of the *Mémoires des Antiquaires de France* as well as of the various numismatic journals of Europe. The result of all this patient investigation is the admirable volume recently published under the title *Numismatique Constantinienne: iconographie et chronologie, description historique des émissions monétaires*, par JULES MAURICE. Tome I. (Paris, Leroux, 1908. Pp. clxxix + 507. Pl. xxiii.)

This substantial work is divided into four distinct parts. The first of these contains introductory essays on the organization and work of the mints, on the makeup (*anatomie*) of the coinage, and on the different kinds of coins struck during the time in question. The second part is devoted to the chronology of the chosen period, which extends from the first of May, 305 to the ninth of September, 337. Under each year the author records historic events and clearly shows the great value of the coins as a means of checking, supplementing, or correcting the literary sources. The third is a most interesting discussion of the portraits of the emperors as they appear upon the coins in the end of the third century and the first half of the fourth. The

fact that quite different heads are found on the coins of a single emperor has led most scholars hitherto to believe that these representations are not real portraits at all. For this most perplexing problem M. Maurice believes that he has discovered a satisfactory solution in the assumption that under the new imperial organization of Diocletian each of the emperors had the right to issue money not only in his own name but in the names of his colleagues as well, and that in many cases, when a mint had not yet received all the necessary portraits, coins were issued bearing the name of one of the joint emperors and the head of another. Doubtful as this theory seems to be at some points, yet, using it as a principle, M. Maurice has brought order out of chaos and has reconstructed in a series of beautiful plates (i-xvi) an imperial portrait gallery which is quite in harmony with all that can be learned on the subject from Aurelius Victor, Lactantius, and other sources. A careful comparison of these portraits with the extant portrait busts of the period will doubtless yield further interesting results. The fourth and last part contains the detailed description and classification of the coins issued by the five mints of Rome, Ostia, Aquileia, Carthage and Trier from the year 305 to the year 337. The other fourteen mints of the empire will form the subject of a second volume, which will complete a standard work of reference invaluable to every student of the Constantinian epoch.

The book is well printed and has very few typographical errors which the author himself has not corrected in the *addenda*. I have noted only *Lurgitionum* (p. xxvi, end), *Cripsus* (pl. xi), and the remarkable statement with which I bring this brief notice to a close (p. xxxix): Le système de Dioclétien comprend encore un petit bronze qui a servi de base aux évaluations de l'Édit du maximum pour les denrées, publié par cet empereur en 1901.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

Aristotle's art of poetry; revised text, with critical introd., translation and commentary by Ingram Bywater. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1909. 46+387 pp. 8°, cl., \$5.25.

Byrne (Lee). The syntax of high school Latin. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1909. 9+54 pp. 8°, cl., 75 cts. net.

Caesar. De bello Gallico, iv. 20-36; v. 1-23, by W. A. Edward. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1909. 39+103 pp., il. 12°, cl., 50 cts.

Campbell (F. W. Groves). Apollonius of Tyana; with an introd. by Ernest Oldmeadow. New York, *Mitchell Kennerley*, 1909. 7-120 pp. 8°, cl., \$1 net.

Cicero. Orationes; pro P. Quinctio, al. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit A. C. Clark. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1909. Various paging. 12°, cl., 75 cts.

— De finibus bonorum et malorum; libri quinque; with introd. and commentary by W. M. L. Hutchinson. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1909. 32+238 pp. 8°, cl., \$2.40 net.

Cole (P. R.) Later Roman education in Ausonius, Capella and the Theodosian code. New York, Teachers' College, 1909. 39 pp. 12°, pap., 25 cts.

Cowles (W. L.) Selections from Ennius, Catullus, Tibullus, and Propertius, with parallel passages from Horace, Ovid and Martial. Amherst, Mass., 1909. 7+84 pp. 12°, cl., 60 cts.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) Hellas and Hesperia; or the vitality of Greek studies in America. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1909. 130 pp., por. 12°. (University of Virginia, Barbour-Page foundation.) Cl., \$1 net.

Harry (Jos. E.) Studies in Euripides; Hippolytus. 71 pp. 8°. (University of Cincinnati studies.) pap. 1909.

Hayes (C. H.) An introduction to the sources relating to the Germanic invasions. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1909. 229 pp., D., pap., \$1.50.

Hellenica Oxyrhynchia cum Theopompi et Cratippi fragmentis; recog. brevique adnotatione critica instruxerunt B. P. Grenfell et Arth. S. Hunt. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1909. Various paging. 12°, cl., \$1.10.

Horace. The satires; with an introd. and notes by E. P. Morris. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1909. c. 254 pp. 12°, cl., \$1.

Justinian I. The digest of Justinian; tr. by C. H. Monro. V. 2. New York, *Putnam*, 1909. 8+453 pp. 8°, cl., \$4 net. V. 1 published by *Macmillan*, 1904.

Masson (J.) Lucretius, Epicurean and poet. V. 2, supplementary. New York, *Dutton*, 1909. 20+204 pp. 8°, cl., \$2 net.

Ogden (C. J.) De infinitivi finalia vel consecutivi constructione apud, priscos poetas Graecos. New York, *Macmillan*, 1909. 60 pp. 8°, cl., \$1.25 net.

Overstreet (H. A.) The dialectic of Plotinus. Berkeley, Cal., *University of California Press*, 1909. 29 pp. 4°, pap., 25 cts.

Plutarch's complete works. V. 6. New York, *Thomas Y. Crowell & Co.*, 1909. 8°, cl., \$7.50.

Prince (J. D.) Assyrian primer. New York, *Macmillan*, 1909. 60 pp. 8°, pap., \$1 net.

Ritchie (F.) Ritchie's first steps in Latin; ed. by F. C. Staples. New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1909. 106 pp. 12°, cl., 60 cts.

Rice (B. L.) Mysore and Coorg. From the Inscriptions published for Government. London, 1909. 8°, 12s. 6d. net.

Stewart (J. A.) Plato's doctrine of ideas. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1909. 206 pp. 8°, cl., \$2.

Trevelyan (E. S.) Folk-Lore and Folk-Stories of Wales. London, 1909. 364 pp. 8°, 10s. 6d. net.

Taylor (Alfred E.) Plato. New York, *Dodge Publishing Co.*, 1909. 151 pp. 12°, cl., 50 cts. net.

Theophrasti characteres; ed. H. Diels. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1909. 28+68 pp. 8°, cl., 90 cts.; pap., 75 cts.

Thucydides. Histories; book iv.; ed. by T. R. Mills; with an introd. by H. Stuart Jones. New York, *Oxford University Press* (Amer. Branch), 1909. 25+244 pp. 8°, cl., 90 cts.; notes only, cl., 60 cts.

FRENCH.

Dartois (J. L.) Le néo-latinisme, thèse, in-16. *Soc. des auteurs-éditeurs*. 2 fr. 50.

Millot (S.) Dictionnaire des formes cursives des caractères chinois, in-4°. *E. Leroux*. 40 fr.

Vissière (A.) Premières leçons de chinois, in-8°. *E. Leroux*. 12 fr.

Waltz (R.) Vie de Sénèque. Paris, 1909. 8°, 7 fr. 50 c.

Wiéger (P. L.) Folk-lore chinois moderne, textes, trad., et notes, in-8°. *E. Guilmoto*. 12 fr.

GERMAN.

Annotationes super Lucanum. Primum ad vetustissimorum codicum fidem ed. Ioa. Endt. (xii, 447 S.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1909. m. 8.60.

Aristophanis pax. Ed. Konr. Zacher. Praefatus est Ottom. Bachmann. (xxxii, 137 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1909. m. 6.

Ausonius u. Venantius Fortunatus. Moselgedichte. 2 Ausg. v. Carl Hosius. (viii, 118 S. m. Abbildgn. u. 1 Karte.) 8°. Marburg, *N. G. Elwert's Verl.*, 1909. m. 2.20.

Baaz (Ericus). De Herodiani fontibus et auctoritate. (82 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *E. Ebering*, 1909. m. 2.40.

Beiträge zur Assyriologie u. semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, hrag. v. Frdr. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt. VI. Bd. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *J. Hinrichs' Verl.* 5. Heft. Ungnad, Arth.: Untersuchungen zu den Urkunden aus Dilbat, nebst e. Anh.: Die Lücke in der Gesetzesstele Hammurais. (iv, vi, 149 S.) 1909. m. 10.80.

— VII. Bd. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 1. Heft. Inschriften aus Syrien, Mesopotamien u. Kleinasien. Gesammelt im J. 1899 von Max Frhrn. v. Oppenheim. Mit Beiträgen v. Max van Berchem, Jul. Euting, Nicol. Finck u. a. I. Arabische Inschriften. Bearb. v. Max van Berchem. Mit 26 Abbildgn. u. 7 Lichtdr.-Taf. (156 S.) 1909. m. 11.50.

Ben Jehuda (Elleser). Thesaurus totius hebraeae et veteris et recentioris. (In hebr. Sprache.) Vol. I. (xv, 580 S. m. Bildnis.) Lex. 8°. Berlin-Schöneberg, *Langenschiedt's Verl.*, 1909. m. 23.

Bibliothek, indogermanische. Hrag. v. Herm. Hirt u. Wilh. Streitberg. I. Abtlg. Sammlung indogerman. Lehr- u. Handbücher. I. Reihe: Grammatiken. 8°. Heidelberg, *C. Winter, Verl.* 6. Bd. Thurneysen (Rud.) Handbuch des Alt-Irischen. Grammatik, Texte u. Wörterbuch. I. Tl.: Grammatik. (xvi, 582 S.) 1909. m. 16.

Boisacq (Emile). Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes. 3. livr. (S. 161-240.) gr. 8°. Heidelberg, *C. Winter, Verl.*, 1909. Subskr.-Pr., m. 2.

Brakman (J. F.) Ammianae et Annaeana. (iii, 38 S.) gr. 8°. Leiden, *Buchh. u. Druckerei, vorm. E. J. Brill*, 1909. m. 1.

Dissertationes philologicae Argentoratenses selectae. Edd. B. Keil et R. Reitzenstein. Vol. XIV. gr. 8°. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*. Fasc. I. Rosenmeyer (Ludov.): Quaestiones Tertullianae ad librum adversus Praxean pertinentes. (viii, 98 S.) 1909. m. 3.

Domaszewski (Alfr.) Abhandlungen zur römischen Religion. (viii, 240 S. m. 26 Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1909. m. 7.

Elter (Ant.) Prolegomena zu Minucius Felix. (Progr.) (63 S.) gr. 8°. Bonn, *C. Georgi*, 1909. m. 1.20.

Geffcken (J.) Kynika u. Verwandtes. (vii, 156 S.) gr. 8°. Heidelberg, *C. Winter, Verl.*, 1909. m. 5.

Graesse (J. G. Th.) Orbis latinus od. Verzeichnis der wichtigsten lateinischen Orts- u. Ländernamen. 2. Aufl., m. neu bearb. v. Frdr. Benedict. (vii, 348 S.) Lex. 8°. Berlin, *R. C. Schmidt & Co.*, 1909. m. 10.

Herakleitos v. Ephesos. Griechisch u. deutsch v. Herm. Diels. 2. Aufl. (xvi, 83 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1909. m. 3.20.

Luciani quae feruntur Podagra et Ocypus. Praefatus, ed., commentatus est Johs. Zimmermann. (xii, 82 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1909. m. 4.

Nelson (Axel). Die Hippokratische Schrift *περὶ φρωῶν*. Text u. Studien. Diss. (iii, 119 S.) gr. 8°. Upsala, *A.-B. Lundequistka Bokhandeln*, 1909. m. 4.

Möller (Geo.) Hieratische Lesestücke, f. den akadem. Gebrauch hrag. (In 3 Heften.) 1. Heft. Alt- u. mittelhierat. Texte. (iv, 8. u. 25 Bl.) 36,5 x 26 cm. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.*, 1909. m. 4.

Papyrus, hieratische, aus den königl. Museen zu Berlin. 43,5 x 32,5 cm. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* 5. Bd. Texte, literarische, des mittleren Reiches. Hrag. v. Aufl. Erman. II. Die Erzählg. des Sinuhe u. die Hirtengeschichte. Bearb. v. Alan H. Gardiner. 18 Lichtdr.-Taf., Umschreibg. u. Übersetzg. (15 S. Text u. 18 Taf. in Autogr.) 1909. m. 20.

Parīśīstas, the, of the Atharvaveda. Ed. by G. M. Bolling and Jul. v. Negelein. Vol. I. Text and critical apparatus. Part 1. Parīśīstas I-XXXVI. (xxiv, 234 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *O. Harrassowitz*, 1909. m. 13.

Rigveda, der, in Auswahl, v. Karl F. Geldner. 2. Tl. Kommentar. (v, 242 S.) Lex. 8°. Stuttgart, *W. Kohlhammer*, 1909. m. 9.

Sachs (A.) *De tragicorum graecorum carminibus astrophis et nuntiorum orationibus.* (Diss.) (66 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *K. Trenkel*, 1909. m. 2.

Saga-Bibliothek, altnordische. Hrg. v. G. Cederschiöld, H. Gering u. E. Mogk. gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. 14. Heft. *Hálfs Saga ok Hálfsrekka*. Hrg. v. A. Le Roy Andrews. (viii, 141 S.) 1909. m. 4.

Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Kommentare zu griechischen u. römischen Schriftstellern. gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. Jüthner, Jul.: *Philostatos, üb. Gymnastik.* (viii, 336 S.) 1909. m. 11.

Sudhaus (S.) *Der Aufbau der Plautinischen Cantica.* (vii, 154 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1909. m. 6.

Vollgraff (Wilh.) *Nikander u. Ovid.* 1. Tl. (vii, 143 S.) gr. 8°. Groningen, *J. B. Wolters*, 1909. m. 5.

Ziehen (Jul.) *Neue Studien zur lateinischen Anthologie.* (40 S.) gr. 8°. Frankfurt a/M., *M. Diesterweg*, 1909. m. 1.80.

ITALIAN.

Studi italiani di filologia classica. Vol. XVII. Firenze, 1909. 8°. 472 pp. V. 1906 Nr. 1694. L. 20.

Trombetti (A.) *Saggi di glottologia generale comparata.* I. *I pronomi personali.* Bologna, 1900. 4°. 363 pp. L. 18.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Am Ha-Aretz (The). The Ancient Hebrew Parliament. A chapter in the Constitutional History of Ancient Israel. Philadelphia, *Julius H. Greenstone*, 1909.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. Vol. XIII, No. 2, April-June, 1909. Norwood, *The Norwood Press*.

— Index to Volumes I-X, 1897-1906. New York, *The Macmillan Co.*

Angus (S.) Hellenistic and Hellenism in our Universities. Connecticut, *Hartford Press*, 1909.

Aristotle, On the Art of Poetry. A revised text, with critical introduction, translation, and commentary. By Ingram Bywater. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*, 1909. \$5.25 net.

Arkiv för Nordisk Filologi utgivet genom Axel Kock. 26. B. (N. F. 22. B.) H. 1. Lund, *C. W. K. Gleerup*, 1909.

Arnoldt (Emil). Gesammelte Schriften. Band V, VI. Berlin, *Verlag von Bruno Cassirer*, 1909.

'Αθηνά. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν 'Αθήναις Ἐπιστημονικῆς Ἑταιρείας. Τόμος εἰκοστὸς πρῶτος. Τεύχ. Α', Β', Γ'. 'Αθήνησιν, Π. Δ. Σακελλάριος, 1909.

Beiträge zur Gesch. der deutschen Sprache u. Literatur. Unter Mitwirkung von Hermann Paul u. Eduard Sievers hsgb. von Wilhelm Braune. XXXV. Band. 2. Heft. Halle a. S., *Maz Niemeyer*, 1909.

Bergfeld (H.) De Versu Saturnio. Gotha, *Perthes*, 1909. 3 m.

Bulletin International de l'Académie des Sciences de Cracovie. Classe de Philologie. No. 10, 1908. No. 1 et 2, 1909. Cracovie, 1909.

Bureau of Science (The), Manila. Seventh Annual Report of the Director, Paul C. Freer. For the year ending Aug. 1, 1908. Manila, *Bureau of Printing*, 1909.

Cauer (Paul). Die Kunst des Übersetzens. 4. Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1909.

Certamen Poeticum Hoenftianum. Amico Monita. Sex Carmina. Amstelodami, *Apud Io. Mullerum*, 1909.

Churchill (William). The Fale 'ula Library Bulletin of the American Geographical Society. Vol. XLI. No. 5. New York, *The Society*, 1909.

— Samoan Phonetics in the Broader Relation (Journal of Polynesian Society, Vol. XVII).

Ciceronis (M. Tulli Orationes). Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit A. C. Clark. Oxonii, e *Typographeo Clarendoniano*. Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis, MDCCCXCIX. 2s. 1d.

Dickermann (Sherwood Owen). De argumentis quibusdam apud Xenophontem, Platonem, Aristotelem obviis e structura hominis et animalium petitis. Halis Saxonum, *Typis Wischani et Burkhardtii*, 1909.

Dictionary of Learned Men of Yâqût (Irshâd al-arîb ila Ma'rifat al-adîb). Ed. by D. S. Margollouth, and printed for the Trustees of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial. Vol. II. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*. London, *Luzac & Co.*, 1909.

Diels (Hermann). Herakleitos von Ephesos. Griechisch u. Deutsch. 2. Aufl. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1909. 3 m. 20 pf.

Duff (J. Wight). A Literary History of Rome from the origins to the close of the Golden Age. New York, *Charles Scribner's Sons*, 1909.

Ebeling (Rudolf). Mathematik u. Philosophie bei Plato. Zum Jahressb. des Gymnasiums. *Herman Münden*, 1909.

Eitrem (S.) Hermes und die Toten. Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandling for 1908. No. 5. Christiania, *Jacob Dybwad*, 1909.

Englische Textbibliothek, 14. Shakespeare's Othello herausg. von M. M. Arnold Schröer. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter's Universitätsbuchhandlung*, 1909. M. 1.70.

Gaffiot (Félix). Pour le vrai Latin. Paris, *E. Leroux*, 1909.

German American Annals. New Series, Vol. VII, No. 4. Old Series, Vol. XI, No. 4. July and August, 1909. Philadelphia, *The German American Historical Society*.

Gildersleeve (B. L.) Hellas and Hesperia or The Vitality of Greek Studies in America. New York, *Henry Holt & Co.*, 1909.

Goebel (Julius). Goethes Quelle für die Erdgeistscene. Reprinted from the Journal of English and German Philology. Vol. VIII. No. 1.

Handbook of Greek Archaeology (A). By Harold North Fowler and James Rignall Wheeler with the collaboration of Gorham Phillips Stevens. New York, *American Book Co.*, 1909.

Harry (J. E.) Studies in Euripides. Hippolytus. University of Cincinnati Studies. Cincinnati, 1908.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XX. Cambridge, *Harvard University*, 1909.

Hellenic Herald (The). Vol. III, No. 30. Ed. C. Pouptis. London, 1909. 10s. per annum.

Herwerden (Henricus van). Euripidis Hypsipylae fragmenta. Traiecti ad Rhenum, *Apud A. Oosthoek*, 1909.

Hirschy (N. C.) Artaxerxes III. Ochus and his Reign. (Bern Dr. Diss.) Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1909.

Hadley (Harwood). The Authenticity and Date of the Sophoclean Ajax, Verses 1040-1420. (Columbia Un. Diss.) Lancaster, *New Era Printing Co.*, 1909.

Ibn Miskawayh (The History of). Reproduced in facsimile with a Preface and Summary by Leone Cactaris. Printed for the Trustees of the E. J. W. Gibb Memorial. Vol. I. Leyden, *E. J. Brill*. London, *Luzac & Co.*, 1909.

Inguagiato (V.) Origine della Visione dantesca. Palermo, *Tip. "Gazzetta Commerciale"*, 1908.

Jahrbuch der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft. Hsgb. von Alois Brandl und Max Förster. 45. Jahrg. Berlin-Schöneberg, *Langenscheidtsche Verlagsbuchhandlung*, 1909.

Jones (Daniel). The Pronunciation of English. Cambridge, *University Press*, 1909. 90 cts.

Journal of Hellenic Studies. Vol. XXIX. Part I. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1909.

Kinnaird (Percy). The Evolution of Money. Nashville, *Marshall & Bruce Co.*, 1909. Pamphlet 50 cts., book \$1.00.

Kroll (W.) Der Ursprung des Dramas. Sonder-Abdruck aus: Zeitschrift für Gymnasialwesen. LXIII Jahr. Berlin, 1909.

Krumbacher (Karl). Das Programm des neuen Thesaurus der griechischen Sprache. (Sonderabdruck aus "Internationale Wochenschrift für Wissenschaft, Kunst, u. Technik". 29. Mai, 1909.)

— KTHTΩP. Ein lexikographischer Versuch. (Sonderabdruck aus Band XXV der "Indogermanischen Forschungen".) Strassburg, K. J. Trübner, 1909.

Laubscher (Gustav George). The Past Tenses in French. (J. H. U. Diss.) Baltimore, J. H. Furst Co., 1909.

Lewis (Lawrence). The Advertisements of The Spectator. Boston and New York, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1909. \$2.00.

Linguistic Survey of India. Vol. III. Tibeto-Burman Family. Part I. General Introduction, Specimens of the Tibetan Dialects, The Himalayan Dialects, and the North Assam Group. Compiled and edited by G. A. Grierson. Calcutta, Superintendent of Government Printing, India, 1909.

Ludwich (Arthur). Aeschylea. Regimonti, *Ex officina Hartungiana*, 1909.

Marchant (E. C.) Thucydides. Book III. London, Macmillan & Co., Limited, 1909.

Μελέτη (H.) Μηνιαῖον δημοσίευμα. Ἀπρίλιος. Μάιος. Ἰούνιος-Ἰούλιος, 1909. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, Σύλλογος πρὸς διάδοσιν ὠφελίμων βιβλίων. @ 1 δρ.

Meltzer (H.) Gibt es ein rein präsentes Perfekt im Griechischen? (Sonderabzug aus "Indogermanische Forschungen". Bd. XXV (1909), 338-356.)

Ménandre. L'Arbitrage. Édition critique accompagnée de notes explicatives et d'une traduction par Maurice Croiset. Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1908.

Montgomery (James A.) An Aramaic Ostrakon from Nippur and the Greek Obolos. (From the Journal of the Am. Or. Society. Vol. XXIX, 1908, pp. 204-209.)

Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum Geschichte und deutsche Literatur und für Pädagogik. Hsgb. von Johannes Ilberg und Bernhard Gerth. 12. Jahrg., 1909. XXXIII. und XXIV. Bandes 4. 5. 6. 7. Heft. Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1909.

Neuphilologische Mitteilungen. Hsgb. vom Neuphilologischen Verein in Helsingfors. Nr. 3/4. 5. 1909.

Novatiani De Trinitate Liber. Ed. by W. Yorke Fausset. Cambridge, At the University Press. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909. \$2.

Old Testament in Greek. According to the text of Codex Vaticanus, supplemented from other uncial MSS, with a critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the text of the LXX. Ed. by A. E. Brooke and N. McLean. Part II. Exodus and Leviticus. Cambridge, University Press. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1909. 12s.

Oldest Known Writing in Siamese (The). An Address before the Siam Society by C. B. Bradley. Reprinted from the Siam Society. March, 1909.

Oldfather (William A.) Livy I, 26 and the Supplicium de More Maiorum. Extracted from Transactions of the Am. Ph. Ass., Vol. XXXIX, 1909.

Oriental Bibliography. Compiled and edited by Lucian Scherman. Vol. XXI (1907). Second Part. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1909.

Oxford English Dictionary (The). Edited by Sir James A. H. Murray. 8-8AUC. Vol. VIII. By Henry Bradley. Oxford, Clarendon Press, July 1, 1909.

Parīśistas (The) of the Atharvaveda. Edited by George Melville Bolling and Julius von Negelein. Vol. I. Text and Critical Apparatus. Part I. Parīśistas I-XXXVI. Leipzig, Otto Harrassowitz, 1909.

Pascal (Carlo). Letteratura latina medievale. Novi saggi e note critiche. Catania, Balliati, 1909. L. 3.

Postgate (J. P.) Flaws in Classical Research. (From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Vol. III.) London, Henry Frowde, 1909. 8s. 6d. net.

Proceedings of The Society of Biblical Archaeology. Vol. XXXI. Part 5. London, *At the Offices of the Society*, 1909.

Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1904-1905. Division III. Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria. Section B. Parts 2 and 3. By William Kelly Prentice. Leyden, *Late E. J. Brill*, 1909.

Reitzenstein (R.) Studien zu Quintilians grösseren Deklamationen (= Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft in Strassburg, 5).

Revista de la Facultad de Letras y Ciencias. Universidad de la Habana. Vol. VIII. Num. 2. Marzo de 1909. Num. 3. Mayo de 1909.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Hsgb. von August Brinkmann. 64. Bandes. 2. 3. Heft. Frankfurt a. M., *J. D. Sauerländer's Verlag*, 1909.

Robertson (A. T.) A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament. New York, *A. C. Armstrong & Son*, 1909. \$1.50.

Rodenwaldt (Gerhart). Die Komposition der Pompejanischen Wandgemälde. Mit 38 Abbildungen im Text. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1909. 9 m.

Saunders (Catharine). Costume im Roman Comedy. New York, *The Columbia University Press*, 1909. \$1.25 net.

Schlachter (L.) Statistische Untersuchungen über den Gebrauch der Tempora und Modi bei einzelnen griechischen Schriftstellern. II. Herodot. III. Thukydides. (Sonderabzüge aus "Indogermanische Forschungen". Bd. XXIII (1908), 165-204 u. Bd. XXIV (1909), 189-221.)

Schlicher (J. J.) The Temporal Cum-Clause and its Rivals. (Reprinted from Classical Philology, Vol. IV, No. 3, July, 1909.)

Semitic Study Series. No. XI. The Mishnah Treatise Sanhedrin. Edited by Samuel Krauss. No. XII. Selections from the Arabic Writings of Maimonides. Edited by Israel Friedlaender. Leiden, *Late E. J. Brill*, 1909.

Streitberg (Wilhelm). Die Zukunft der deutschen Sprache. Sonderabdr. aus Jahrg. 1909 der Germanisch-Romanischen Monatsschrift.

Τεσσαρακονταετηρίς τῆς καθηγουσίας Κ. Σ. Κόντου. Φιλολογικαὶ διατριβαὶ ὑπὸ τῶν μαθητῶν καὶ θαυμαστῶν αὐτοῦ προσφερόμεναι. Ἐν Ἀθήναις, Τύποις Π. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, 1909.

Thackeray (Henry St. John). A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint. Vol. I. Introduction, Orthography and Accidence. Cambridge, *At the University Press*, 1909. New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*. \$2.50 net.

Triandaphyllidis (Man. A.) Die Lehnwörter der mittelgriechischen Vulgärliteratur. Strassburg, *Karl J. Trübner*, 1909.

Verslag over den Wedstrijd in Latijnsche Poëzie over het Jaar 1908/9. Overgedrukt uit de Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letter-Kunde, 4e Reeks, Deel X. Amsterdam, *Johannes Müller*, 1909.

Wallstedt (Emil). Studia Plantina. (Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. N. F. Afd. 1. Bd. 5. Nr. 3.) Lundae, 1909.

Wilhelm (Adolf). Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde. (Sonder-schriften des öster. archäolog. Institutes in Wien. Band VII.) Wien, *Alfred Hölder*, 1909. M. 35.

— Urkunden des Attischen Reiches. (Aus dem Anzeiger der phil.-hist. Klasse der Kais. Akad. der Wissensch. Nr. X vom 28. April 1909 separat abgedruckt.)

— Zu den Inschriften des Bundes der Magneten. (Sonderabdruck aus Hermes, 44. Band, 1909.)

— Zu den Inschriften von Priene. (Sonderabdruck aus den "Wiener Studien" 1907, Band XXIX, Heft. 1.)

Wilamowitz-Möllendorff. Das Griechentum als lebendige Kraft. (Sonderabdruck aus "Mitteilungen des Vereins der Freunde des humanistischen Gymnasiums in Wien", 8. Heft.) Wien u. Leipzig, *Carl Fromme*, 1909.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich von). Erklärungen Pindarischer Gedichte. Sitzungsber. der Königl. Preuss. Akad. der Wiss. XXXII. 1909. 24. Juni.

Wilmanns (W.) Deutsche Grammatik, Gotisch, Alt-Mittel- u. Neuhochdeutsch. III. Flexion. 2. Hälfte: Nomen u. Pronomen. 1. u. 2. Aufl. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*, 1909. 9 m.

Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen. Hsgb. von H. J. Müller. 63. Jahrg. Der neuen Folge 43. Jahrg. Juni. Juli-August. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1909.

Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Litteratur. Hsgb. von Edward Schroeder u. Gustav Roethe. 51. Bd. 1. Hft. (24. Juni.) Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1909.

Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Litteratur herausgegeben von Dr. D. Behrens. Band XXXIV. Heft 6 u. 8. Der Referate und Rezensionen drittes und viertes Heft. Chemnitz u. Leipzig, *Verlag von Wilhelm Gronau*, 1909.

— Band XXXIV. Heft. 5 u. 7. Der Abhandlungen drittes u. viertes Heft.